THE INFLUENCE OF HEINRICH BULLINGER AND THE TIGURINE TRADITION UPON THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

By

Frank Gulley, Jr.

Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Vanderbilt University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in
Religion

June, 1961
Nashville, Tennessee

Approved:	Date:
Daniel Bard Thompson	May 18, 1961
PHHardacre	May 19, 1961

Preface

Heinrich Bullinger is virtually unknown, not simply to the English-speaking world in general, but among professional historians as well. To date there is no biography of the man in English nor has there been any attempt to see his impact upon the reform movements spread over Europe in the sixteenth century. If this dissertation helps to rectify this neglect it will have served its purpose.

To undertake a thorough analysis of Bullinger's influence upon the English Reformation would require years of patient digging in numerous repositories both in England and on the continent. It is to be hoped that in the not too distant future such a project will be undertaken. For the present, however, this study is concerned to introduce the reader to the possible channels of Bullinger's influence in England with particular reference to his theological influence upon the English church.

My indebtedness to all the persons who have assisted in the writing of this dissertation is so great as to preclude description. Special mention must go to Professor D. Bard Thompson, my teacher and friend, who encouraged me to undertake the project and who sustained me through many periods of discouragement. Professor Paul H. Hardacre, who aided in the research and writing, has been most helpful in his criticisms and suggestions.

To Professor Fritz Blanke of the University of Zurich, the leading Bullinger scholar of our day, goes grateful appreciation for his wise counsel and helpfulness in clarifying obscure points of the Tigurine Reformation. I am deeply grateful to the Lilly Endowment Inc. of Indianapolis, Indiana for a grant which made it possible for me to do research at the University of Zurich and at Oxford, England.

Finally, I wish to express my praise for and appreciation to the numerous librarians who have assisted in one way or another in the research which has made this study possible. The staffs of the Zentralbibliothek, Zurich and the Bodleian Library, Oxford have been most cooperative. Special thanks is extended to the staff of the Joint University Libraries, Nashville, Tennessee for the numerous courtesies extended to me during my years as a graduate student in Vanderbilt University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE. ii

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER I. 7

Introduction. 7

Part I: The Tigurine Church in the Sixteenth Century. 10

Part II: Anglo-Tigurine Relation - 1530-1547 28

CHAPTER II THE INFLUENCE OF HEINRICH BULLINGER UPON JOHN HOOPER 47

1) Inception of the Friendship 48

2) Hooper in Zurich 1547-1549. 51

3) The Journey to England. 58

4) Hooper at Work (May 16, 1549 - January 1, 1550) . 64

CHAPTER III ANGLO-TIGURINE RELATIONS: 1547-1553 . . . 73

1) Background. 73

2) Foreign Theologians in England. 75

3) John a Lasco and the Strangers' Churches. 87

4) Bullinger's Literary Influence in the Edwardian Period 101

5) Hooper and the Edwardian Religious Struggles. . .113

6) Summary and Conclusion. 145

CHAPTER IV THE THEOLOGICAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HEINRICH BULLINGER AND JOHN HOOPER . . .156

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

1) Introduction. 156

2) Bullinger and Hooper on Covenant Theology 164

3) Bullinger and Hooper on Christian Authority . . .175

4) The Sacramental Theology of Bullinger and Hooper 183

a) Bullinger's Sacramental Doctrine. 184

b) Hooper's Sacramental Doctrine 192

5) Bullinger and Hooper on the Eucharistic Liturgy .198

CHAPTER V THE ZURICH EXILES. 210

CHAPTER VI ANGLO-TIGURINE RELATIONS 1559-1575. 228

1) Introduction. 228

2) Zurich and the Puritan Struggles. 232

3) Bullinger and the Papal Bull of 1570. 267

4) The Prophesyings. 270

5) Bullinger's Literary Influence in England 1559-1586. 274

CONCLUSION 283

I The Sources of the Reformed Tradition. 283

II The Contribution of Bullinger and the Reformed Tradition to the Spread of the Reformed Faith in England. 287

BIBLIOGRAPHY 291

A

INTRODUCTION

No subject in church history has received closer scrutiny than the forces at work in the English Reformation. The importance of social, political, and economic factors has been studied, while at the same time church historians have evaluated the complex interaction of ideas, both religious and secular, which ultimately formed the church and set its course. The formative influences of the Catholic and Lollard traditions have been duly recognized, as have those contributions of Luther, Calvin, Bucer, and Martyr. It is the purpose of this dissertation to show that another force was at work in English Christianity in the sixteenth century--a force heretofore almost completely ignored: the influence of Heinrich Bullinger and the Tigurine tradition.

This study will proceed with three objectives. First it shall be our purpose to delineate the avenues of Tigurine influence, more especially the channels of Bullinger's influence insofar as they are discernible. In the second place, when possible concrete examples of that influence will be indicated. And finally an attempt will be made to set Tigurine influence in proper perspective along with the other forces at work on the English church in the sixteenth century.

Bullinger was a man of deep concern for the church in all of Europe. One need only examine the eleven thousand letters comprising his correspondence which are on deposit in the state archives of Zurich and in the Zentralbibliothek of that city, to appreciate the breadth of his interest. These epistles written to Bullinger and by him form the most important primary source for this study. Those particularly pertinent to English affairs were edited, translated, and published by the Parker Society. The two volumes of Zurich Letters (1842-1845) deal with Anglo-Tigurine ecclesiastical relations in the reign of Elizabeth; while the two volumes of Original Letters (1846-1847) comprise the correspondence in the period 1537-1558. A fifth volume of correspondence, collected from numerous repositories in England and on the continent, and dealing with the same general theme and period, was published by George C. Gorham under the title Gleanings of a Few Scattered Ears during the Period of the Reformation in England . . . AD 1533 to AD 1588 (1857).

For Bullinger's theology the archives of the Zentralbibliothek (Zurich) are the most extensive and complete. Here one has access to all of his writings in both printed and manuscript forms. Until 1840, when Gorham had several of Bullinger's sermons published in English, none of his writings had appeared in print since the sixteenth century. Shortly thereafter the Parker Society reissued the four volume edition of his Decades. Finally, in 1953 a sermon of Bullinger's on the nature of the church was selected by the editors of the Library of Christian Classics for inclusion in that series.

These volumes and other manuscripts in Zurich have been accessible for this study. Apart from the writings just mentioned, one must rely upon the valuable materials found in Strype's works, in the collections of the Alcuin Club, the Camden Society, and the Parker Society.

Bullinger's importance for English church history has been recognized by numerous scholars in the past, but none has given extensive study to the depth of that influence. Many years ago Allen Hinds wrote: "At the head of the Zurich church was the erudite Bullinger, a man universally respected, and who exercised and continued to exercise a vast influence over the English Protestants of all opinions."[1] His judgment was also echoed by the learned Maitland a few years later: "A better example of a purely spiritual power could hardly be found than the influence that was exercised in England by Zwingli's successor, Heinrich Bullinger. Bishops and Puritans argued their causes before him as if he were the judge."[2] Even today Bullinger's influence has been recognized by H. F. Woodhouse: "While one can endorse the general statement that the Anglican divines sought from continental Protestants inspiration and guidance, it is possible that a case might be made out that Bullinger, Zwingli's successor, had more influence than any other single figure, ..."[1]

---

[1] Allen Hinds, The Making of the England of Elizabeth (New York: Macmillan and Co., 1895), p. 43.

[2] F. W. Maitland, "The Anglican Settlement and the Scottish Reformation," The Cambridge Modern History, ed. A. W. Ward, et. al. (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1902), II, 597.

As early as 1840 Fel von Orelli, at the request of the Hülfsgesellschaft prepared a short manuscript titled Antistes Bullingers Gastfreundschaft gegenüber Flüchtlinge Glaubensgenossen. Therein Bullinger's relationship to the English church received proportionate, but scanty attention. Such was also the handling of the subject by Carl Pestalozzi in his extremely valuable biography Heinrich Bullinger. Leben und ausgewählte Schriften (1858). A quarter of a century later J. C. Mörikofer handled the subject with greater skill and accuracy in his Geschichte der Evangelischen Flüchtlinge in der Schweiz (1876).

It was not until the last decade of the nineteenth century, however, that the subject was considered of sufficient importance for exclusive consideration. It was Theodor Vetter who gave his many talents to explicating the relationship. In 1891 he set forth his Johannes Hooper, Bischof von Gloucester und Worcester und seine Beziehungen zu Bullinger und Zurich. Though this study numbers only a few pages it was the first serious attempt to explore Anglo-Tigurine relations in the sixteenth century. This study was followed in 1893 with another brief essay by him titled Englische Flüchtlinge in Zürich während der ersten Hälfte des 16.

---

[1] H. F. Woodhouse, The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology 1547-1603 (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1954), p. 167.

Jahrhunderts. Here Vetter explored the broader field of Anglo-Tigurine relations with special emphasis upon John Bale as a significant link in the relationship. An abbreviated English version of this study appeared in 1904 under the title Relations between England and Zurich during the Reformation. Vetter studied another dimension of the subject in 1901 in his essay titled Litterarische Beziehungen zwischen England und der Schweiz im Reformationszeitalter. Vetter stands as the first historian to see the important relationship between these two great centers of reformation activity, but his work suffers from brevity and superficiality.

It was C. H. Smyth in his study Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI. (1926) who next made the most important advance in handling the subject. Though it was not his primary purpose to explore this theme, his research and conclusions, if somewhat doubtful in other parts of the study, on this theme are sound and significant.

Since Smyth's labors, numerous studies have been written dealing with various phases of Anglo-Tigurine relations. Most of them have been journal articles more concerned to survey their subject than to give a critical analysis of it. One monograph, however, should receive special mention at this point. In 1953 W. M. S. West completed his doctoral dissertation at the University of Zurich on the subject "John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism." Mr. West is a thorough scholar who has produced a well-documented analysis of the intimate relation between Hooper and Bullinger. His efforts have borne out the belief of Vetter and others that the relationship between Zurich and England in the sixteenth century is a fertile field for exploration.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

With the close of 1533 the independence of the English church from Rome was secured. The ecclesia anglicana was then a national church with a temporal monarch as "supreme head." From the continent hope was expressed that other changes would result, that a true reformation was in the making. But Henry VIII was, for all practical purposes, a devout catholic, and thus the church subject to his authority would reflect that faith. At the same time Henry was a politician, and when the moment dictated it, the church became a pawn in his political maneuvering. In the period 1530-1540, foreign affairs forced him to entertain plans of church reform in order to win the political favor of the German Lutherans. English churchmen negotiated with the Lutherans in good faith only to have their sovereign break off the negotiations when they no longer were politically expedient. Hence officially the Church of England in the reign of Henry reflected a conservative catholic spirit.

But on the unofficial side great changes were taking place in English church life. Disciples of the new humanism and of the old Lollard tradition paved the way for the new reforming spirit of the sixteenth century. Contrary to the laws of the land, books of the continental reformers were smuggled into England and were diligently read by laymen and clergy alike. As early as 1520, the Oxford bookseller, John Dorne, sold copies of Luther's De potestate papae.[1] In the following year the Archbishop of Canterbury, Warham, complaimed to Wolsey that Luther's books were appearing in Oxford in abundance. It was not until Rome declared Luther a heretic on June 15, 1521, that action was taken in England to subvert these heretical publications.[2] Luther's books were burned, and the reading or possession of his works was strictly prohibited.

Though the Lutheran reformation dominated the thinking and reading of churchmen everywhere in the 1520's, and especially those of a reforming spirit in England, yet Englishmen were also open to the views of other continental reformers. Evidence for this is to be found in the promulgation in 1529 of the Libri sectae sive factionis Lutherianae importate ad civitatem London, an index of prohibited books which banned, in addition to those of Luther, the works of Zwingli, Brenz, Bugenhagen, Bucer, Regius, Melanchthon, Oecolampadius, Agricola, Lambert, Wesel, Gochius, and Carlstadt.[3]

---

[1] R. R. Darlington et al., The English Church and the Continent (London: The Faith Press Ltd., 1959), p. 60.

[2] Thomas M. Lindsay, A History of the Reformation (2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908), II, p. 320.

[3] Frederick J. Smithen, Continental Protestantism and the English Reformation (London: James Clark & Co. Limited, n.d.), p. 45.

The degree of Zwingli's influence in England at this time is uncertain. To be sure his books were being read in the 1520's, for why else would they have been declared heretical? In 1531 Zwingli's preeminence was such that his views were sought, along with other continental reformers, on the annulment of Henry VIII's marriage to Catharine of Aragon. Archbishop Cranmer wrote, in 1537, to Joachim Vadian, the reformer of St. Gall, insisting that, "I have seen almost everything that has been written and published either by Oecolampadius or Zwinglius . . . ."[1] Other Englishmen also indicated their acquaintance with Zwingli's works, notably Nicholas Ridley,[2] John Frith,[3] and Miles Coverdale.[4] As the instigator of a reformation independent of Luther and in some respects antagonistic to his, Zwingli commanded attention. In the second Battle of Kappel (October 11, 1531), the great German-Swiss reformer was slain. His successor as antistes in the church of Zurich naturally would inherit some of the influence and prestige of his predecessor. Such was to be the case of Heinrich Bullinger, Zwingli's twenty-seven year old successor. Zwingli surely opened the door by means of which Bullinger's name eventually became known in England. But it was left to Bullinger to create for himself a position of preeminence independent of that of Zwingli. In time Bullinger's influence in England was to be far greater than Zwingli's[1] To provide a background for the detailed study of this influence, a summary account of the state of the Tigurine church in the sixteenth century is given. Early intercourse between Zurich and England is then described, with special reference to the role of travellers and correspondents. It is clear that through these intermediaries Bullinger acquired an influential following in England by 1547, and the way was paved for his direct intervention in the years which followed.

---

[1] Hastings Robinson (ed.), Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation (2 vols.; "The Parker Society"; Cambridge: The University Press, 1846-47), I, p. 13. Hereafter referred to as "OL."

[2] Henry Eyster Jacobs, The Lutheran Movement in England (Philadelphia: G. W. Frederick, 1894), p. 207.

[3] Ibid., p. 38.

[4] Ibid., p. 117.

Part I: The Tigurine[2] Church in the Sixteenth Century

Traditionally Reformation scholarship has insisted that the Zwinglian Reformation was founded upon a negative biblical authority i. e., that which is not specifically commanded in scripture is prohibited. On this principle, it was believed, Zwingli proceeded to construct a liturgy and to purge the church of a great deal of the traditional Roman symbolism and ceremonial. But more recent scholarship e. g., Bard Thompson, has shown this view to be entirely too rigid and legalistic, and untrue to the principles which actually motivated Zwingli's reforms. Indeed his reformation principles were infinitely more profound and penetrating. Fundamental to Zwingli's reforming activities was his concern that the Word of God be proclaimed with boldness, clarity and power. To that end every element of the church's life had to witness to the fullest and without contradiction.

---

[1] A case could be made that Zwingli's fame in England was directly related to that of Bullinger. The majority of Zwingli's works which were translated into English received their publication in the reign of Edward VI (1547-1553), when Bullinger's influence was at its peak in England.

[2] See p. 70 for an explanation of the use of this term.

The reformation in worship most vividly illustrates the changes which occurred as a result of the application of this principle. In place of the elaborate Roman Mass which reflected Roman theology and tradition, there was substituted a simple, brief, vernacular liturgy which stressed the preaching of the Word. The pulpit replaced the altar in the center of the church as the focus of the congregation, and on the appropriate occasion a large table was stationed in the midst of the people for the Lord's Supper giving expression not only to divine truth, but also emphasizing the communion of man with man. Music in all forms was omitted, not that music was somehow ungodly, but that it might interfere with the hearing of the divine Word. The minister conducting worship presented himself before the people in the habit of men of letters, not eucharistic vestments. The elements of the communion were administered in both kinds from crude wooden vessels passed among the people permitting each person to serve himself.[1] Certainly a reformation had taken place. No doubt at first Zurichers looked upon it as a revolution; certainly some looked upon the change as blasphemy. The service repeatedly received the charge from critics as barren and austere. The churchmen of Zurich admitted that it was simple, but this was a result of its being biblical and thus God-ordained. Thus is is also pure. These are the proper descriptive terms: simple and pure, not barren and austere. Certainly they would have added a third adjective: beautiful. The charge that their worship was lacking in beauty would have bewildered them. Is not that which is derived from God's holy word beautiful? Thus it was that Englishmen in the eighteenth century who visited Zurich discovered a church founded upon radically different principles of worship from their own.

In the realm of education Zwingli made a significant contribution to the reformation cause. He believed the medieval Latin schools in Zurich to be inadequate for the education of men who would lead the evangelical cause. Hence he asked and was granted permission of the city officials to revise the curriculum and structure of the city school system. There came into existence, as a part of this revision, the Carolinum. The Carolinum, which opened on June 19, 1525, was basically a theological college established from funds of the Grossmünster. It consisted of the collegium humanitatis for the study of ancient languages, philosophy, and mathematics and the Carolinum proper for the study of the Bible. A fundamental part of the Carolinum was the exegetical exercise known as the prophezei.[1] Zwingli derived the name from the biblical injunction: "Make love your aim, and earnestly desire the spiritual gifts, especially that you may prophesy." (I Cor. 14:1). The procedure for the prophezei was as follows: At eight o'clock each morning (Friday and Sunday omitted), all students and clergy of the city gathered in the choir of the Grossmünster. (Attendance was compulsory.) Sessions were opened with a brief prayer after which a student read to the group assembled a text of scripture from the Vulgate (in Zwingli's time from the Old Testament). Following this reading Ceporinus[2] discussed the same text as it appeared in Hebrew giving attention to exegetical problems and especially to any divergencies which might have appeared between the

---

[1] Bard Thompson, "Reformed Liturgies in Translation. I. Ulrich Zwingli," Bulletin Theological Seminary of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, XXVII (October, 1956), p. 7f.

---

[1] Heinrich Bullinger, Reformationsgeschichte, eds. J. J. Hottinger and H. H. Vogeli (3 vols.; Frauenfeld: Ch. Beyel, 1838), I, p. 289ff. See also Emil Egli, "Prophesying" The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, IX (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1911), p. 278.

[2] Ceporinus (Ceporin, Jacques), Born in 1499 in Dynhart, a small village in the canton of Zurich. Studied at the universities of Cologne, Vienna, and Ingolstadt. He became a master of Hebrew and Greek. In 1525 he was invited by Zwingli as an associate in Old Testament. He also taught Greek and Hebrew, and was the author of a Greek grammar. He died on December 20, 1526.

Hebrew and Vulgate texts. At the conclusion of this discussion, Zwingli read the identical text from the Septuagint and concluded with a discourse on its dogmatic and homiletical use. Up to that point the discussion had been in Latin. In the meantime the townspeople with their German Bibles had gathered in the nave of the church. With the conclusion of this scholarly portion of the study, a minister, usually Megander or Jüda in the early days, stepped to the pulpit, summarized in Swiss-German the conclusions reached in the earlier study and made them applicable to everyday living. After a short prayer, the prophezei was concluded for the day. So it was that the prophezei came into existence as a means of training ministers and students of the ministry in the fundamentals of the biblical faith. Only an educated ministry could in turn produce an educated and enlightened laity.

In later years there were some modifications of procedure. In 1534, the sessions were moved from the choir of the Grossmünster to a recently completed auditorium. At the same time the two professors involved began to deal in alternate weeks with the Old and New Testaments. With the arrival in 1556, of Peter Martyr as a new member of the faculty, that portion of the prophezei which interpreted the text to the people was abandoned. Thus the prophezei was reduced to a series of theological lectures.[1]

---

[1] Emil Egli, "Prophezei" Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, ed. Albert Hauck (3. Auflage; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1905), XVI, pp. 108-110. See also Bullinger's Reformationsgeschichte, I, p. 290f.

In later years the prophezei was to appear in modified form in other Reformed communities in Switzerland, and, more important for our study, in other European countries, especially England. It was an important device for the spread of Reformed Protestantism. There is little doubt that the English students who journeyed to Zurich in Henry's reign, as well as the flood of them that would come later, daily participated in the prophezei.

Because English students coming to Zurich were so intimately associated with the prophezei, it is important that some mention be made of its distinguished faculty, especially Conrad Pellican, Theodor Bibliander, and Peter Martyr Vermigli.

Within a year after the opening of the prophezei in Zurich, Ceporinus died and was succeeded by the brilliant Hebraist Conrad Kürsner, better known as Pellican.[1] Pellican was born in 1478 in Rufach (Alsace) to Conrad Kürsner of Weil and Elizabeth Kleinhänsler of Rufach. At the age of six he entered the village school where he learned the medieval curriculum. In 1491 he enrolled at the University of Heidelberg where his uncle was rector. Here he remained for sixteen months. In September, 1492, he returned home for lack of funds and occupied himself for several months as an assistant to the local schoolmaster. Intrigued by the educational possibilities at a nearby Minorite cloister, he permitted himself to be enrolled in the order in 1493, and was vowed the following year. Two years later he was sent to study under the famous humanist, Paul Scriptorius.

---

[1] Biographical data on Pellican is derived from his Hauschronik.

From early youth Pellican wished to learn Hebrew. While in the monastery, a converted Jew gave him a Hebrew Bible which whetted his determination even more to master the language. At every free moment he studied grammar and memorized vocabulary. His facility with the language gained for him the friendship of Reuchlin and Erasmus. In years to come he was regarded as the greatest living Hebraist.

In 1502, Pellican received an appointment as professor of theology, philosophy, and astronomy at the University of Basel. Two years later a doctorate was conferred upon him by that school. As the years passed, Pellican received high appointment in his order, and, at the same time, became fascinated by the writings of Martin Luther. In the period 1519-1524, he became convinced that Luther's theological emphases were correct and set about to use his high offices to expedite the publication of Luther's works. This was the beginning of his troubles. Month by month he became more convinced of the truth of the Protestant cause. In the winter of 1526-27, he received an invitation from Zwingli to fill the chair of Old Testament at Zurich. On February 19, 1527, Pellican accepted the appointment. For twenty-nine years he labored untiringly in the Zurich schools. He was a prolific writer publishing volumes of commentaries, Hebrew grammars and dictionaries. But most important for our concern, he was a close friend of Englishmen who came to study under him. The Zurich Letters testify to their affection for him as a person and as a teacher, and to their high regard for his scholarship. He died in 1556.

Pellican's colleague and close friend was Theodor Bibliander (Buchmann).[1] He was born in Bischofszell in Thurgau in 1504 (1509?). Very early in his life, his parents decided he should prepare for a church vocation, and so he was sent to Zurich to study under Myconius[2] and later under Ceporinus, who gave him a firm grounding in Hebrew. From Zurich he moved to Basel where Pellican and Oecolampadius greatly influenced him. On the death of Zwingli in October, 1531, an invitation was extended to him to occupy the chair of theology in Zurich created by the Reformer's death.

It would seem that Bibliander's great love was languages, for he frequently referred to himself as homo grammaticus. He was also a competent biblical exegete. Because of his excellent analysis of the prophets, he has been called the "father of exegetical theology in Switzerland." His writings were numerous and varied: A Hebrew grammar (1535), a polyglot and commentary on language method (1548), an edition of the Koran (1543), numerous commentaries on the New Testament, and polemics against the Roman church.

---

[1] Biographical data on Bibliander comes from: Emil Egli, "Bibliander (Buchmann), Theodor" RTK, III, pp. 185-187; Emil Egli, Analecta Reformatoria, II (Zurich: Zurcher und Furrer, 1901).

[2] Oswald Myconius (1488-1546), A Swiss Reformed theologian. He was a teacher in the Frauenmünster school in Zurich and as associate of Zwingli. In 1531 he became a preacher and professor of theology in Basel where he died. He assisted in writing the first and second Confessions of Basel (1534-1536).

As a theologian, Bibliander was never completely in accord with Reformed theology. In his inaugural address, Oratio ad ennarationem esajae (1532), to the carolinum in Zurich, he expressed with great vigor his belief that God has planted the law in man's heart that all men might achieve truth and holiness. Thus he opposed the consequence of the doctrine of predestination. He was concerned to give expression to man's free choice as he faces the grace of God. His views came into bitter clash with those of Peter Martyr in 1556, when the latter expressed a strong Calvinistic doctrine of election. As a result, Bibliander was retired in 1560 from his teaching post. He died in September, 1564, of the pestilence.

Bibliander was a favorite among the English students in Zurich in the first half of the sixteenth century. An early group of students expressed their appreciation to Bullinger for all that had been done for them by the Zurich citizenry, and especially by "that chief ornament of Switzerland, yea, rather of the whole world, Theodor Bibliander; . . . ."[1] John Hooper, in the years spent in

---

[1] OL, II, p. 623.

Zurich, found in Bibliander a dear friend. Bibliander's wife stood as a godparent at the baptism of Hooper's daughter, Rachel. It was Bibliander who instructed Hooper in the principles of biblical exegesis,[1] and who dedicated to him in 1552, his Sermo divinae maiestatis wherein he set forth these principles. Upon his return to England, Hooper pleaded with Bibliander to dedicate some of his writings to the English nobility for the advancement of the reformation cause in England. He complied by dedicating his De legitima vindicatione christianium veri et sempiterni to the tutor of King Edward VI, Sir John Cheke. In later years his influence seems to have waned because the Marian Exiles seldom referred to him in their letters after they returned to England.

Upon the death of Pellican in 1556, the chair of Old Testament was filled by a man of great importance, Peter Martyr Vermigli.[2] Martyr, as he was most frequently called, was born in 1500 of Florentine parents. At the age of sixteen, he entered the Augustinian monastery at Fiesole, near Florence. As a student of the humanities and philosophy at Padua, Martyr achieved a proficiency in scholastic theology. In the period 1526-1542 he grew in favor with his order and was given the responsibility for teaching scripture in certain cloisters under his jurisdiction, and for lecturing in philosophy at Padau, Ravenna, Bologna, and Vercelli. By means of his study, he was driven behind the church fathers to the source of their authority, the scriptures. As a prior of the wealthy benefice, S. Pietro as Ara, at Naples, he became critical of the rites and ceremonies of the church. Doubtless his criticism was in part inspired by the works of Bucer, Zwingli, Melanchthon, and Erasmus; nor must one forget the powerful influence of Juan Valdes under whose spell Martyr fell in this period.

---

[1] Emil Egli, Analecta Reformatoria, II, p. 97.

[2] Biographical data on Peter Martyr comes from: Joseph C. McLelland, The Visible Words of God (London: Oliver and Boyd, 1957), pp. 1-68.

In 1539, he was appointed vicar general of his order. From this high office he exercised authority in correcting abuses which had arisen from monastic luxury and immorality. In 1542, when the Inquisition struck Italy, Martyr fled to Switzerland where he made friends with Bullinger. Because there was no employment available to him in Zurich, he moved to Strassburg where, through Bucer's influence, he received an appointment as professor of theology. McLelland believes this five year period in Strassburg (1542-1547) was crucial for Martyr's theology.[1] He points to the fact that immediately upon his arrival in England in early 1548, Martyr was forced to defend his theology against strong Catholic adversaries. Thus his theology matured in the Strassburg interim, and was, no doubt, colored by the orientation of Bucer. With the imposition of the Interim of Charles V, the reformers in

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. 13.

Strassburg were forced to flee, and so Martyr accepted the invitation of Cranmer to go to England.

From 1547-1553, England was Martyr's home. Upon his arrival, he was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, and served as a consultant to the crown on ecclesiastical matters. His great influence upon the reformation in England has not been fully appreciated. For our purposes it is sufficient to note that he had great influence on his English students, many of whom were to hold posts of importance in the Elizabethan church. Aside from Martin Bucer, no theologian obtained the preeminence in England that Peter Martyr did.

Upon the death of Edward VI and the accession of Mary, Martyr abandoned Oxford and headed for the continent. He settled again at Strassburg and received his old teaching appointment in the College of St. Thomas. Several of his English students followed after him and renewed their studies in that city.

With the death of Pellican in 1556, Martyr was invited to occupy his chair. He accepted and left Strassburg in July bringing with him several of his English students. From the summer of 1556 until his death in the fall of 1562, he was a revered teacher in the Zurich carolinum. In the struggles of the Elizabethan church no voice was heard with greater authority than that of Martyr. Indeed Peter Martyr must be considered a major link betwen Anglo-Tigurine ecclesiastical affairs in the sixteenth century. We shall meet him many times later in this study.

These intellectual giants along with others less well-known gave Zurich a reputation for great learning throughout Europe. In fact no center of Protestantism could boast a more learned faculty. Hence it must never be forgotten that when in 1541, Calvin was returning to Geneva for a second try at establishing a reformation, Zurich was already a city founded upon reformation principles and boasting an evangelical seminary of European-wide reputation.

To conclude this survey attention must be given to the most important Tigurine churchman in the period of our study, Heinrich Bullinger.[1]

With the demise of Zwingli, the German-Swiss reformation was without leadership. The terms of the second Peace of Kappel, if strictly followed, in time would have destroyed all that had been achieved in Zurich. Fortunately Zwingli's successor as *antistes* was a man of great capability. He was wise, erudite, and gifted with the ability to reconcile opposite points of view. Heinrich Bullinger has appropriately been called the "savior of the Zurich Reformation."[1]

---

[1] The following biographical data is derived from:

Fritz Blanke, *Der Junge Bullinger 1504-1531* (Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1942).

Heinrich Bullingers Diarium (Annales vitae) der Jahr 1504-1574, ed. Emil Egli (Basel: Basler Buch- und Antiquariatshandlung, 1904).

Ludvig Lavater, *Vom Leben und Tod des Eerwirdigen und Hochgelerten Herren Heinrychen Bullingers*, 1576.

Carl Pestalozzi, *Heinrich Bullinger, Leben und ausgewahlte Schriften* (Elberfeld: R. L. Friderichs, 1858).

Gustav von Schulthess-Rechberg, *Heinrich Bullinger, der Nachfolger Zwinglis* (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1904).

Bullinger was born in 1504, in Bremgarten to Heinrich Bullinger, a priest in the Roman church, and his mistress, Anna Wiederkehr. Until he was twelve years of age, young Heinrich attended the schools of his home town. In 1516, he journeyed to Emmerich where he enrolled in the Latin school already attended by his older brother, Johann. Here the young boy received his first taste of humanistic learning.

Heinrich studied there until 1519, when he left for Cologne where he matriculated at the university. Since the years 1511-1514, the University of Cologne had witnessed a struggle between scholasticism and humanism. Both viewpoints were ably defended by their respective partisans when Bullinger studied there. Bullinger seems to have been influenced especially by the humanists Arnold von Wesel and Phrissemius. It was here that Bullinger learned of Luther and Melanchthon, and read their works, but does not seem to have been greatly aroused by the activity of these men. That he began to question the old scholastic dogmatism is certain. In time he would notice that the medieval classics e.g., the Sentences of Peter Lombard, were based upon the church fathers and that the church fathers derived their authority from the Bible.

---

[1] Johann Sutz, Heinrich Bullinger, der Retter der zurcherischen Reformation (Zurich: Beer und Cie, 1915).

Thus the Bible would become his sole authority. In 1520, he was awarded a B.A. degree and in 1522, an M.A. degree.

In April, 1522, Bullinger, now eighteen years old, returned to Bremgarten where he spent almost twelve months in reading and studying on his own. These were important months for they reveal Bullinger's decision to side with the cause of the reformation. His "conversion" was the result of reading and shows no indication of resulting from any direct association with persons.

In the spring of 1523, Wolfgang Joner, abbot of the Cistercian cloister at nearby Kappel, invited Bullinger to teach in the monastery school. Bullinger accepted with the provision that he would not be expected to take vows of any sort which would obligate him in any way to follow the monastic life. As a teacher concerned with reform, Bullinger introduced to his students the works of Augustine, Chrysostom, Erasmus, Luther, and Melanchthon. His teaching bore results. In 1525, the mass was no longer said in the cloister. In 1526, the Lord's Supper was observed by a simple rite. In 1527, the monks agreed to dissolve their monastic community and take up normal lives in the world.

The Kappel period (1523-1529) in Bullinger's life is important also for the friendship he established with Zwingli. The two men first met in 1523. Thereafter they had numerous contacts at the various disputations held to determine the course of the reformation in Zurich. A five month leave of absence in 1527, was granted by Joner so that the young scholar might study in the prophezei in Zurich. Here the friendship between Bullinger and Zwingli deepened greatly. During these months Bullinger met Anna Adlischwiler, a nun in the Oetenbach convent, whom Bullinger later married. She bore him eleven children.

In 1529, Bullinger was invited to his home town to assume the pulpit (along with Gervasius Schuler) previously held by his father as a priest in the Roman church. The elder Bullinger had been influenced by the reforming trends of the time, and had declared to his congregation that he had taught them false doctrine for twenty-five years, and henceforth "with God's help . . . [would] show the true way to salvation alone according to the word of God." A strong catholic-minded group, angered by this pronouncement, drove the elder Bullinger from the town. In time, however, the evangelicals gained the ascendency, and the young Bullinger was invited to help institute the reformation there. From May, 1529, until the conclusion of the second Peace of Kappel, Bullinger labored for the cause of the reformation in Bremgarten. But after the second Kappel War, Bremgarten was lost to the reformation, and Bullinger retired to Zurich.

Who was to succeed Zwingli as chief minister in the Zurich church? This was the problem which faced the citizens of Zurich in November, 1531. The post was offered to Oecolampadius of Basel, but because of ill health, he was unable to accept the responsibility and soon died. The offer was then extended to Heinrich Bullinger, the younger. On Sunday morning, November 23, 1531, Bullinger entered the pulpit of the Grossmünster and preached to the Zurich church. Myconius wrote of the occasion: "Doch am letzten Sonntage hat Bullinger ein solche Predigt herunter gedonnert, dass es Vielen vorkam, Zwingli sei nicht todt, sondern er sei gleich dem Phönix wieder erstanden."[1] On December 9, 1531, Bullinger was elected to the office of antistes. He was twenty-seven years old.

Bullinger's role in Zurich in the years immediately following his appointment was that of conserver rather than that of reformer. Zwingli had accomplished the reformation in Zurich. It was then Bullinger's job to conserve what was gained, to strengthen it, and make it a bulwark for other places giving birth to reform, and thus to have it serve as an inspiration and guide. His first job was to battle two groups who opposed the Zurich reformation. With the death of Zwingli, the latent catholic party in Zurich found a new lease on life. In opposition to them Bullinger consistently exerted the principles of the reformation, especially the idea that the pulpit is free and cannot be controlled by civil authority. He was also forced to deal with the Anabaptists who were not satisfied with what they considered a half-way reformation, but wished a more radical and consistent application of Zwinglian principles. Between the extremes Bullinger guided the Zurich church.

---

[1] Pestalozzi, op. cit., p. 72.

In the years ahead Bullinger maintained a grueling schedule. He preached weekly six or seven times. Not until 1542 was his schedule cut to two times a week. In addition he was a prolific writer. As an author he was tireless in his attempts to communicate the gospel. His writings total approximately 170 treatises of one kind or another. As a correspondent, he was indefatigable. Bullinger was interested in church affairs in every country of Europe, and he had correspondents in all. His extant correspondence numbers 12,000 letters and represents the writing of over seven hundred correspondents.

With the death of Zwingli, the Zurich carolinum was in need of a professor of theology. Bullinger did not elect to assume that responsibility. Nevertheless, he was keenly interested in the educational system and was responsible for a school ordinance which regulated the schools in the canton of Zurich. Through the medium of those schools, churches throughout Europe were supplied with qualified ministers--one of the most significant contributions that Zurich made to the reformation.

Bullinger was responsible also for the revision of the church polity through a preacher ordinance and a synodal ordinance. The preacher ordinance, composed by Bullinger and

Jūda, remained legally operative for over three hundred years. It gave direction for the examination and election of the clergy, their official duties in preaching, conducting worship, the cure of souls, administration of the sacraments, and ministerial conduct.

Bullinger made great sacrifices for his exiled brothers of the faith. Since Switzerland was at the cross-roads of the continent, refugees from all over Europe flocked there for asylum. Zurich surely received its share of these wanderers, and Bullinger was never tardy in extending to them his own crowded home as a refuge. Englishmen were not the least to share this generosity.

In the following pages we shall see how intimately Englishmen were associated with and influenced by Bullinger and the Tigurine tradition in the sixteenth century.

Part II: Anglo-Tigurine Relations, 1530-1547

An important link in those early years between England and Zurich was the Swiss printer Reyner Wolf, who came to England and set up shop in London near St. Paul's cathedral.[1] It seems that he served as "mailman" between the English and the Swiss and probably first pointed English travelers toward Switzerland.[2] He journeyed each year to Germany to attend the

---

[1] Theodor Vetter, *Englische Flüchtlinge in Zürich während der ersten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Zurich: [Hohr], 1893), p. 3.

[2] Charles H. Smyth, *Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1926), p. 80f.

Frankfort fair where he exchanged letters with the Zurich printer Froschover.[1] But the very fact that someone was needed in this role indicates that a relationship between the two countries was already in existence.

The earliest known Englishmen to visit Zurich arrived in the late 1530's. In general they were travelers; some were merchants interested in commerce; others were students.[2] Bullinger records in his diary that in August, 1536, three English youths arrived at his home: John Butler, William Udroff (probably Woodrooffe), and Nicholas Partridge.[3] Butler and Udroff were given lodging in the house of Conrad Pellican and were joined later by another English student designated simply as "William."[4] The three youths lived there until autumn of the same year when Pellican's wife died. Then they were sent away to other lodging in the town.[5] Meanwhile,

---

[1] For an interesting article on the postal "system" of the sixteenth century consult Emil Egli, "Briefpost in 16. Jahrhundert," *Zwingliana*, I (1897-1904), pp. 229-235.

[2] Smyth, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

[3] *Heinrich Bullingers Diarium (Annales vitae) der Jahr 1504-1574*, ed. Emil Egli ("Quellen zur Schweizerischen Reformationsgeschichte"; Basel: Basler Buch- und Antiquariatshandlung, 1904), p. 25. Hereafter referred to as "Bullinger's *Diarium*."

[4] *Die Hauschronik Konrad Pellikans von Rufach*, deutsch von Theodor Vulpinus (Strassburg: Heitz und Mundel, 1892), p. 134. The reference reads as follows:

> "Am 18. August kamen zwei Engländer zu uns ins Haus, Joh. Buttler und Wilhelm Udroff, denen sich bald ein dritter (er heiss gleichfalls Wilhelm) zugestellte."

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 135.

Nicholas Partridge proceeded to Zurich independently of the others. He was passing through the city on his way to Italy, when he fell ill and was nursed back to health in Bullinger's home.[1] The two men formed a close friendship which was to last until Partridge's untimely death a few years later.

Precisely why these students were in Zurich is not clear, but there can be little doubt that they were students who had come to the continent to visit first-hand some of the reformation centers and to learn from the reformation leaders. To be sure, this is precisely what they did. No doubt they studied in the prophezei under Zurich's famous faculty, and especially did they enjoy the tutelage of Bullinger in his own home.[2]

The first of these four students to leave Zurich was Partridge who journeyed toward England on January 24, 1537.[3] Traveling with him was Bullinger's foster-son Rudolf Gualter,[4] who remained in England with Partridge until the summer of 1537 when the two returned to Zurich. The purpose of the trip is not known, but that Bullinger utilized it to make important contacts in England is certain. As the two boys left Zurich, they carried with them letters from Bullinger, and possibly books, to persons of influence in England.[1] Bullinger possibly sent communications to old friends there, but that he sought contacts by letter with men of influence unknown to him is certain.[2] Thus these two boys went forth on a great mission.

---

[1] OL, I, p. 124.

[2] Carl Pestalozzi, Heinrich Bullinger. Leben und ausgewählte Schriften ("Leben und ausgewählte Schriften der Väter und Begründer der reformirten Kirche"; Elberfeld: R. L. Friderichs, 1858), p. 256.

[3] Bullinger's Diarium, p. 25.

[4] Rudolf Gualter (Gwalter, Gwalther, or Walter). Born on November 9, 1519, of an extremely poor family. While Gualter was still a child, his father was accidentally killed. In 1528 he entered the cloister school at Kappel where he studied under the relatively unknown teacher, Heinrich Bullinger. The latter readily perceived that the boy was gifted and proceeded to give him special attention. When Bullinger was called to Zurich in 1531, Gualter was invited by his teacher to come live with him and eat at his table. Thus

Gualter kept a diary of his journey.[3] He records that his party arrived in England on March 3, and headed directly for London. Three days later their destination had

---

Bullinger became a foster-father to him. From 1538-1541, he studied at Basel, Strassburg, Lausanne and Marburg where he concentrated his study in the fields of theology, philosophy, mathematics and poetry. In 1541 with the help of the Landgrave of Hesse, he attended the Regensbergh Disputation of which he sent a report to Zurich. In 1543, while still a very young man, he succeeded Leo Jüda as minister of St. Peter's Church in Zurich. From that pulpit he became a famous preacher and writer. He wrote many volumes of biblical commentaries which were translated into every language of the Reformed world. He will be important to this study for the years 1558-1575 when Puritans and Anglicans wrote to him for advice in church matters. He succeeded Bullinger in 1575 as *antistes* of the Zurich church. ---Emil Egli, "Gualter (Walter), Rudolf," *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, ed. Albert Hauck, VII (1899), pp. 222-224.

[1] *OL*, I, p. 124.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 124f.

[3] Paul Boesch, "Rudolph Gwalters Reise nach England im Jahr 1537," *Zwingliana*, VIII (1944-1948), pp. 433-471.

been reached, and a meeting was held with Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury.[1] Gualter relates that he and Partridge thereupon discharged their commission.[2] This would seem to imply that they carried a letter or some sort of communication to Cranmer, probably from Bullinger.[3] On March 7, Gualter states that he saw Henry VIII, Queen Anne Boleyn and Princess Mary at a distance. On March 11, Gualter and Partridge arrived at Oxford.[4] Here Gualter established friendships which he valued all his life, and which will be important for our study of the Elizabethan church; especially must we mention friendships with Richard Masters, Nicholas Eliot and John Parkhurst. We know that one of Bullinger's letters was delivered to its addressee at this stop: Owen Oglethorp, an Oxford don.[5]

On April 22, Gualter and Partridge were again in London and made a call upon Cranmer. He reports that Cranmer received them very cordially and then dismissed them.[6] Though

---

[1] Ibid., p. 450.

[2] Ibid., "Am 6. März machten wir Thomas Cranmer, dem Erzbischof von Canterbury, unsere Aufwartung und entledigten uns unseres Auftrags."

[3] As we shall see, upon their return to Zurich these boys carried with them a letter to Bullinger from Cranmer which was plainly in reply to an earlier communication probably delivered at this time.

[4] Boesch, op. cit., p. 452.

[5] OL, I, p. 124f.

[6] Boesch, op. cit., p. 456.

Gualter fails to mention it, Cranmer gave the youths a letter addressed to Bullinger which they were to deliver on their return to Zurich.[1] Thereupon the boys headed for Switzerland. After crossing the channel on April 29, they met two English youths, Nicholas Eliot, whom Gualter had previously met at Oxford, and John Finch, who were traveling south.[2] The four journeyed together. By June 8, Partridge and Gualter were back in Zurich[3] having brought with them three more Englishmen.[4] No doubt two of these were Finch and Eliot, the latter being housed in Bullinger's own home.[5] Who the third youth was is not known.[6]

Meanwhile, Pellican was convinced by his friends in Zurich that he ought not live alone. So he remarried in January, 1537, and received back into his home two English students, possibly Woodrooffe and Peterson.[7]

---

[1] Bullinger's Diarium, p. 25. Text of letter in Johannes Kesslers Sabbata mit kleineren schriften und briefen, eds. Emil Egli and Rudolf Schoch (St. Gallen: Fehr'sche Buchhandlung, 1902), p. 463f.

[2] Boesch, *op. cit.*, p. 458.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 461.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 466, note 68.

[5] OL, II, p. 619.

[6] Smyth, *op. cit.*, p. 81, suggests that it was "Mr. Maltravers" (D. Mautrena). It is possible that it was either Woodrooffe or Butler; see also Boesch, *op. cit.*, p. 460.

[7] Smyth, *op. cit.*, p. 82, believes that when Pellican sent his students away in the fall of 1536, John Butler took up residence with the Zurich professor Theodor Bibliander. When Pellican opened his house again to the students, only

In September of this same year another English youth, Bartholemew Traheron,[1] arrived in Zurich. He was a youth who, in later years, would figure prominently in English ecclesiastical affairs. Bullinger must have been singularly impressed by this young man for he records in his diary a poem which Traheron read to him as a means of introduction.[2] There is no doubt that Traheron devoted his time in Zurich to study. Doubtless from this time until 1546, when he went to Geneva, he was a supporter of the Tigurine viewpoint, if not a disciple of Bullinger.

---

two of them returned. These Smyth believes to have been Woodrooffe and Peterson. Pellican himself states the matter simply: "Nun kehrten die beiden Englander an meinen Tisch zuruck." --Hauschronik, p. 136.

[1] Bullinger's Diarium, p. 26; Bartholemew Traheron (1510?-1558?). Descended from an old Cornish family. He was raised by Richard Tracy of Gloucestershire who encouraged him to renounce the "puddles of sophisters." Studied at Oxford and Cambridge as a friar minorite. In the late 1530's he abandoned his habit and crossed to the continent. Early in 1539, Thomas Cromwell took him into governmental service where he remained until the latter's fall from royal favor. In 1546, he was in Geneva where Calvin exercised great influence over Traheron, who gradually abandoned his friend Bullinger's comparatively moderate views and adopted Calvin's doctrine of predestination and antisacramentarian dogmas." In 1548, he was a member of Parliament where he opposed an ambiguous statement on the eucharist. In 1549 he was appointed keeper of the king's library. In February of the following year he received the additional appointment of tutor to the Duke of Suffold at Cambridge. During Edward's reign he held numerous appointments to ecclesiastical commissions. He was a patron to all foreign students who came to England. Upon the Accession of Mary to the throne he went abroad where he participated in 1555 in the Frankfort controversy. Shortly thereafter he moved to Wesel where he lectured in New Testament. Presumably he died there.--DNB. LVII, 148-49.

[2] Bullinger's Diarium, p. 26.

These students[1] remained in Zurich until the fall of 1537, when they left Zurich for Geneva carrying with them letters of recommendation from Bullinger to churchmen along the way.[2] Their stay in Zurich was important. Here they studied in the Zurich prophezei under Pellican, Bibliander, and Bullinger.[3] More important than any facts they may have learned was the appreciation they carried with them of the Zurich reformation and especially of its leaders, Bullinger in particular. No doubt many times during their stay in Zurich the question of a reformation in England was raised. By this time the authority of the papacy in England had been broken. Would other changes in favor of the evangelical cause follow? Certainly there were men in England who would support such a program. To these Bullinger wished to give as much encouragement as possible. But there were also those who had not decided yet to side with the Protestant cause.

---

[1] It is not clear that all of the English students left Zurich in the autumn of 1537, but apparently those living with Pellican did. He records in his Hauschronik, p. 135: "Die Englander bleiben noch bis zum Herbst 1537; dann gingen sie nach Genf." That all of them journeyed together at this time is rather obvious from the "bread and butter" letter written to Bullinger and signed by Butler, Partridge, Eliot, and Traheron. See OL, II, p. 623.

[2] OL, II, p. 620, 623.

[3] That they were influenced by their teachers is clearly seen in the extravagent salutation sent to Bibliander and Pellican via Bullinger: OL, II, p. 623: "We hope you will not think it a trouble to salute diligently in our name Leo Judae, master Pellican, and that chief ornament of Switzerland, yea, rather of the whole world, Theodor Bibliander; the kindness of all of whom, as well as their rare learning, we regard with such veneration as that we can never forget them."

To these also Bullinger wished to direct a word. So it was that these youths left Zurich with their ultimate destination being England. They carried with them memories of Zurich, its church life and leaders, commissions to promote the evangelical cause whenever possible, and last, but not least, the promise from Bullinger actively to aid the cause himself. To that end Bullinger promised to write letters of counsel to men in authority in England and to dedicate some of his own works to the king.

Bullinger was not negligent in the latter promise. In March, 1538, there came from Froschover's presses a two-volume work written by Bullinger and dedicated to King Henry VIII: De s. scripturae authoritate, certitudine, firmitate, et absoluta perfectione; deque episcoporum, qui verbi dei ministri sunt, institutione et functione, contra superstitionis tyrannidisque romanae antistites. (In the same year the first of Bullinger's Latin treatises to be translated into English, came from the press of J. Nicholson in Southwark: Commentary upon the Seconde epistle to the Thessalonians. It bore no dedication.)

Partridge wrote to Bullinger on April 12, 1538,[1] from Frankfort stating that he had received a personal letter from Froschover "together with a parcel . . . of letters and books written to the leading men in our kingdon: by which I easily perceive how greatly you endeavor to make those persons who are most attached to you still more attached."[1] Here is clear evidence of Bullinger's determination to influence English ecclesiastical affairs if possible. Bullinger's letter to Partridge is lost, but we are able to discern its contents from the latter's reply. Obviously Bullinger had expressed fear that his English friends would soon forget him and that probably his efforts at writing, exhorting, etc., were futile. To which Partridge replied:

---

[1] OL, II, p. 608ff.

> These bonds indeed have for a long time been too firm to admit the supposition of their being broken in this present life; so far are you from believing that we can ever cease to remember you here. We are not much pleased with that parenthesis of yours, . . . for unless we be considered as unfeeling and impious, we cannot but regard these your benefits as most highly valuable.[2]

Bullinger continued by urging Partridge and his associates to communicate all news to him about the state of affairs in England and about his friends. In reply Partridge gave unqualified assurance.[3] To that end he related some recent news from England, that certain images and relics of saints had been revealed to be false and had been cast down.

On August 12, Nicholas Eliot in England wrote Bullinger a brief note stating that the latter's books "are wonderfully well received, not only by our king but equally so by the lord Cromwell . . . ."[1] He concluded with an interesting comment: "Your writings have obtained for you a reputation and honor among the English, to say nothing of other nations beyond what could possibly be believed."[2] No doubt this was music to Bullinger's ears. In another letter to Bullinger probably written shortly after the one above, Eliot described Bullinger's literary influence in England in these rather exaggerated terms:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 608.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

> And how great weight all persons attribute to your commentaries, how greedily they embrace and admire them . . . the booksellers are most ample witnesses, whom by the sale of your writings alone, from being more destitute than Irus and Codrus, you see suddenly become almost as rich as Croesus.[3]

In September of that year Partridge wrote again to Bullinger from Frankfort[4] giving the official account of the distribution of Bullinger's letters and books.[5] Upon arriving in England, Partridge and his companions made a call upon Thomas Cranmer, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who received

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 618.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 620.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 610. Between the date of this letter and his previous communication of April, 1538, Partridge made a trip to England which this letter described.

[5] At the beginning of this letter Partridge makes the comment: "No sooner had we touched the soil of our country than we made diligent inquiry concerning the state of the realm; and we have ascertained from persons of good credit, that your influence had been much diminished by reason of that unhappy retraction of yours." p. 611. Precisely what this has reference to is unknown. See the editor's explanation in note 3.

Bullinger's book "most courteously." They asked Cranmer to deliver on their behalf a copy of the book intended for Henry VIII. At first the Archbishop refused, saying that Cromwell should perform that service, but after reconsideration, he agreed to make the presentation on two conditions; first, he must read the book lest he be guilty of recommending something of which he knew nothing, and secondly, provided the youths would be present at the presentation in case the king had any questions.[1] As it happened, the copy was sent to the king by Cranmer and evidently was received favorably, for the king expressed the desire "to those around him, that it should be translated into English."[2] A third copy was presented to Cromwell who was so pleased with the present that he read through it immediately, "notwithstanding he was overwhelmed with business."[3] Indications are that a copy was sent to Bishop Ridley of London, for we are informed that he inquired of Bullinger and desired to write "in reply." A fifth copy was presented to Sir Edward Wooton, who received the book "with the greatest satisfaction," and promised to be at Bullinger's service "if he can oblige in any way."[4] The sixth copy was presented to Bishop Latimer who was most eager to write in reply. Partridge commented to Bullinger of the presentation: "Nothing, believe me, was ever more gratifying to him in the whole course of his life, than the present you sent him."[1] It would seem that only letters were sent to "Matravers" and "the Polsteds."[2]

---

[1] OL, II, p. 611.

[2] Ibid., p. 612.

[3] Ibid., p. 611.

[4] Ibid., p. 612.

In conclusion Partridge discussed the state of religion in England. "The boiling flames of purgatory [Roman Catholicism] are now extinguished among us." Already the Lutheran churchmen were in England "engaged in disputations touching religion" from which everyone expected a happy issue.[3]

In appreciation of Bullinger's friendship, Partridge sent him some hose, Oxford gloves, and a Roman coin. He also requested that Bullinger write to Richard Tracy "for he greatly admires you, and by so doing you may, I hope, be of service to Traheron."[4]

No doubt Bullinger had cause to rejoice in this informative letter. His attempts to make contact with men of influence had been successful. Certainly the star of Bullinger was rising in England.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] In all probability Eliot made these presentations since Partridge assumes that Eliot will furnish the details. Eliot, on the other hand, does not give details, for he assumes that Partridge will see Bullinger soon and can do it much more fully by mouth. OL, II, p. 618.

[3] OL, II, p. 612f.

[4] Ibid., p. 613.

These young students were not to play a significant role in the future history of English church life. In 1540, John Burcher wrote to Gualter of the untimely death of Nicholas Partridge.[1] Butler spent the rest of his life shuttling back and forth between England and the continent. He died in Lindau in July, 1553.[2] Of Nicholas Eliot we know very little. He returned to England and was dead in 1548, when Bullinger sought to make contact with him. Virtually nothing is known of the other students, except Traheron whom we shall meet later in this study.

In 1539, Henry VIII's foreign affairs were in sufficiently good repair as to eliminate any need for Protestant support abroad, and to destroy any reason for permitting evangelical freedom at home. Hence the Act of the Six Articles (1539) asserted the conservative catholic character of the Anglican church once again. This had the result of driving many Englishmen to the continent. In this group Bullinger found two close friends, merchants by profession, who would supply him with news about England for many years to come. They were Richard Hilles and John Burcher, who were chiefly important, not as evangelical theologians, but rather as intermediaries between Bullinger and England.

When Bullinger and Hilles became acquainted is uncertain. Certainly Bullinger had been challenging Hilles with his "hortatory and truly comforting letters" before August, 1540.[1] By this time Hilles had left England in order not to become a "traitor to God and man," but ostensibly in order to carry on trade from the continent.[2] He vowed to live on the continent "unless it should first please God to effect such a change, as that we may serve him there [England] without hindrance, and without being forced to sanction what is evil."[3] After settling in Strassburg, he paid Bullinger a visit in the summer or autumn of 1542.[4] Because of his wealth and his concern for the evangelical cause, he financed many of his brethren in exile.[5] Bullinger diligently instructed him in the proper reading materials for Christian growth,[6] and liberally supplied him with treatises of his own.[7] The correspondence between them ranged in subject from the sale of English cloth to information regarding ecclesiastical and political affairs in England.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 637.

[2] Smyth, op. cit., p. 87.

John Burcher, also a merchant, fled England in 1538.

---

[1] OL, I, p. 196.

[2] Ibid., p. 198.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., p. 230.

[5] Ibid., p. 224, 238.

[6] Ibid., p. 244.

[7] Ibid.

He settled for a time in Strassburg where he learned to know Hilles, moved on to Basel for a few months, and eventually made contact with Bullinger in Zurich around 1541.[1] In Zurich he was able to obtain certain commercial rights which drew him close to Tigurine affairs, and, of course, gave Bullinger another contact with English affairs. It would appear that he took up residence in Zurich around 1543, where he married a Swiss woman.[2] This was to be his base of operations until 1548, when he moved to Strassburg. At that time Hilles and Burcher established a partnership. Hilles returned to England (Edward VI had succeeded to the throne) to head business affairs there, while Burcher acted as continental representative. Henceforth Bullinger had a closer relationship with Burcher than Hilles.[3] Burcher became a chief link with English affairs, and also served Bullinger as carrier of his letters and books to England in the reign of Edward. His later years were filled with sorrow due to the infidelity of his wife. Upon the accession of Elizabeth, he returned to England where he became a clergyman serving a church on the outskirts of London. Smyth makes the interesting judgment that in Burcher we have a

---

[1] Smyth, op. cit., p. 89.

[2] J. C. Mörikofer, Geschichte der Evangelischen Flüchtlinge in der Schweiz (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1876), p. 47.

[3] At least after this period we have more extant letters from Burcher than Hilles. No doubt Hilles welcomed the relief from letter writing for he wrote atrocious Latin for which he consistently apologized.

> . . . forerunner of the new spirit in English life. In spite of his more amiable qualities--his loyalty and his affection--he was a puritan and a bigot . . . . In him are exhibited the salient characteristics of puritanism strongly developed: courage, intolerance, and business ability . . . .[1]

Another refugee to the continent as a result of the Act of the Six Articles was John Bale. Bale was educated at Cambridge where he encountered the New Learning. Through the patronage of Thomas Cromwell, he was shielded from his conservative opponents, but was forced to flee when his patron fell from royal favor. Bale's movements on the continent are vague and uncertain. That he did visit Zurich between 1543-1545, is almost certain.[2] His book, Yet a Course at the romyshe Foxe, written under the pseudonym of John Harrison, was published at Zurich on December 10, 1543.[3]

Bale was much appreciative of the Zurich church and held the Tigurine divines in high esteem. He was especially a close friend of Conrad Gesner, a well-known naturalist and professor of the carolinum in Zurich. Gesner has been called the "father of bibliography" for his publication in 1545, of the Bibliotheca universalis.[4] At approximately this same time Bale was preparing a similar catalogue of English writers which gave those two men a common bond. Bale dedicated a last portion of his catalogue to Gesner wherein he refers to him as "friend and brother."[1]

---

[1] Smyth, op. cit., p. 92f.

[2] Jesse W. Harris, John Bale, A Study in the minor Literature of the Reformation ("Illinois Studies in Language and Literature," Vol. XXV, No. 4; Urbana, Illinois: The University of Illinois Press, 1940), p. 31.

[3] Ibid., p. 31.

[4] J. Christian Bay, "Conrad Gesner (1516-1565). The Father of Bibliography. An Appreciation," The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, X (April, 1916), pp. 53-86.

Of Bale's friendship with Bullinger we know very little. Bale himself gave lavish praise to Bullinger and the Zurich people in the epistle dedicatory to his Pageant of Popes.[2] Beyond this nothing more can be said. Obviously there was no close friendship between these men. To our knowledge they never corresponded, nor did Bullinger ever seek to establish a close friendship with him. Hence our reference to Bale can only be incidental for he does not play a part in this history.

Finally mention must be made of John Hooper, who fled his country for the sake of religion in the winter of 1545-1546, and who was destined to be influenced profoundly by Bullinger and the Zurich church. Because of the depth of this friendship, a separate chapter will be devoted to their relationship.

In the years 1530-1547, Bullinger's name became known in England through his books and letters, and through his association with young English students and merchants. There can be no doubt that Bullinger was intensely interested in English affairs, both political and ecclesiastical. Especially was he concerned to construct the English church, if a reformation were possible, upon the pattern of Zurich. To that end he directed his energies to writing and instructing those who came his way in the principles of a proper and godly reformation. Great success was not possible in those years for Tudor despotism opposed it. Nevertheless friendships were made and seeds planted which would bear fruit in the reign of Henry's son, Edward.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 32.

[2] John Bale, The Pageant of Popes, contayninge the lyves of all the Bishops of Rome, from the beginninge of them to the year of grace 1555 (London: Thomas Marshe, 1574).

CHAPTER II

THE INFLUENCE OF HEINRICH BULLINGER UPON JOHN HOOPER

> If I am able to effect anything, and my slender powers are of any benefit to the church of Christ, I confess, and by the blessing of God will confess, as long as I live, that I owe it to yourself [Bullinger] and my masters and brethren at Zurich.[1]

Such was the testimony of John Hooper in June, 1550, after his return to England. As a student in Zurich, from March, 1547, until March, 1549, Hooper imbibed the Reformed point of view. His understanding of the church, of worship, ministry, and the sacraments, indeed all elements of his theology were formed by the principles of authority he learned there. Departing for England, he was determined that England would have a church based upon the principles which had become so precious to him. Indeed he was so rigidly addicted to principle, that he would not compromise; he would have a godly reformation or no reformation. His firm convictions, ardent zeal, and obstinate personality tossed him into the center of the Edwardian church struggles.

It is the purpose of this chapter to delineate the friendship between Bullinger and Hooper from its inception until the end of 1549. Beginning with 1550, Hooper was at the center of the reformation controversy in England, and that phase of his career will be explored in the next chapter in the context of the total Edwardian reformation.

---

[1] OL, I, 73.

1. Inception of the Friendship

Early in February, 1546, Bullinger received three important letters from Strassburg. Two of them were from old friends: Richard Hilles, an English merchant, and Ludwig Lavater, a Swiss student studying in Strassburg. Both wished to recommend an English student in Strassburg who desired to enroll in the Zurich *carolinum*. The student was John Hooper. Hilles describes him as being "formerly in the court of our king, but now a disciple of Christ, the King of kings, and glowing with zeal and piety, and most attached to your name among those of all other divines."[1] Lavater wrote in the same vein: "He is most attached to you--a well-educated man, most accomplished and most worthy of your friendship--to whom I would wish, if time permits, you might reply."[2] The third letter was from Hooper himself.[3] He stated that while living the life of a courtier he came upon some writings of Zwingli and "some commentaries upon the epistles of St. Paul, which your reverence had published for the general benefit, ..."[1] He was greatly impressed by them and read them "night and day, with earnest study, and an almost superstitious diligence."[2] As a result, "solely" through God's help and that of Bullinger, he was called back from impious worship and blasphemy to the worship of God with a pure heart. He stated that he had long wished to go to Zurich to study, but one thing and then another had prevented it. Now he had determined to fulfil his desire. To accomplish that he planned to return to England "to bid farewell to the honours, pleasures, and friends of this world; and I will then endeavour, if possible, by the assistance of my friends, to obtain at least some portion of what I am entitled to,[3] wherewith I may be able to subsist upon my slender means among you at Zurich."[4] Nevertheless, he insisted that if he had to come in poverty, he was determined to do so, for it would be better "to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season."[5] Hooper requested the prayers of Bullinger and the Tigurine church as he made his journey. No doubt Hilles and Lavater told Hooper of Bullinger's interest in English affairs, for Hooper concluded his letter with the latest news from Britain. He summarized the state of religion in England quite accurately when he commented that king Henry had "destroyed the pope, but not popery . . . . The impious mass, the most shameful celibacy of the clergy, the invocation of saints, auricular confession, superstitious abstinence from meats, and purgatory, were never before held by the people in greater esteem than at the present moment."[1]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 251. Written on January 28, 1546.

[2] Zentralbibliothek, Zurich, Mss F39:733 quoted in W.M.S. West, "John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism" (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, The Theological Faculty, University of Zurich, 1953), p. 31.

[3] *OL*, I, 33-34. Written on January 27, 1546.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 33.

[2] Ibid., p. 34.

[3] Hooper's father opposed the Protestant sympathies of his son, and seemingly was willing to disinherit him if he persisted in his views. OL, I, 75.

[4] Ibid., pp. 34-35.

[5] Ibid., p. 35.

Before Bullinger could answer this initial communication, Hooper took the liberty to address him again on a moral problem.[2] Is it "unlawful" for a "godly man to be present at the mass and impious observances of the like kind among the papists?"[3] Calvin, he said, had written on the matter, but he believed that his reasoning was faulty and inadequate. Thus Bullinger's opinion was solicited with the promise that it would be followed "most diligently . . . without any deceit or dissimulation." This letter is important for two reasons. First, it reveals an attitude and spirit toward worship which, two decades later, would be expressed by the Puritans. Second, at this early date Hooper was looking to Bullinger and Zurich as the source of authority in matters of this sort. Indeed he promised that Bullinger's advice on this matter would be accepted unquestionably. Hence, even before Hooper arrived in Zurich, he bestowed upon Bullinger a rare degree of authority and respect.

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 36.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 38f.

[3] *Ibid*., p. 38.

Bullinger's reply gave great encouragement to Hooper.[1] He assured him that "the true worship of God could have nothing in common with outward idolatry," and thus "it is more advisable and consistent with godliness, that . . . [one] should endure the loss of home and fortune for Christ's sake than participate in the ungodly worship of the mass."[2]

Hooper returned to England in the spring of 1546 enduring severe hardships along the way. By autumn of that year he was back on the continent where he married Anne de Tscerlas, whom he had met the previous year while studying in Strassburg. Shortly thereafter the young couple started for Zurich where they would live two of the most important years of their lives.[3]

2. Hooper in Zurich: 1547-1549

On March 29, 1547, Hooper and his wife arrived in

---

[1] Ibid., p. 40. Bullinger's reply is lost, but we are able to derive from Hooper's subsequent letter to Bullinger its contents.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 40f. This epistle is without date or place, but the editor's notes are convincing that it was composed at Basel after December 12, 1546, and before March, 1547.

Zurich.[1] Bullinger received them warmly and made room for them in his own house until other arrangements could be made in the town. He wrote to Myconius a few days later: "The Englishman whom you commended to me I have been compelled to receive into my own home . . . . I use the word compelled in a manner of speaking only, for I received him willingly and heartily because one can see that he is genuine."[2]

Hooper spent two busy and important years in Zurich. However, our knowledge of his activities there is sparse. This is understandable, for certainly there was little reason for him to write to men with whom he had daily conversation. Nevertheless, an enlightened estimate of his experiences there is possible.

We have discussed in the first chapter the "atmosphere" of Tigurine church-life which was to influence Hooper profoundly. He must have been struck by the utter simplicity of worship which characterized the Tigurine church in contrast to the highly ritualistic worship of the Church of England. Hooper learned that simplicity was tantamount to purity and the touchstone of a proper reformation. We shall see that he learned his lesson well.

Hooper probably spent each morning as a student in the prophezei. From this experience he learned to appreciate this program as a technique for educating men in the evangelical tradition. In later years he would adapt it to his own needs in England.

---

[1] Bullinger's Diarium, p. 35.

[2] Zentralbibliothek, Zurich, Simler collection S63:190, quoted in West, op. cit., p. 33.

As a student he studied with Pellican and Bibliander. He came to know them as teachers whose insights into the biblical faith seemed unlimited. Upon his return to England, he consistently sought their commentaries and unpublished notes on the Bible as ammunition for his work there. His friendship with Bibliander seems to have been very close. It was from Bibliander that Hooper received his ardour for scriptural exegesis.[1] Bibliander dedicated to his student his Sermo divinae maiestatis (1552), an exegesis of the Ten Commandments. Bibliander's wife stood as a god-parent at the baptism of Hooper's daughter Rachel in the spring of 1548.

Hooper revered none in Zurich quite so highly as he did Bullinger. We have already noticed the respect he expressed for Bullinger prior to their meeting. This grew even deeper in the months ahead. This is especially interesting when we notice that Hooper was Bullinger's senior by nearly ten years. Yet there was never any doubt as to who was teacher and who student. Hooper always regarded Bullinger as his spiritual father, and consistently referred to him in letters as "my revered master,"[1] and "most loving master and father."[2]

---

[1] Egli, Analecta Reformatoria, II, p. 97.

Though Bullinger was not a member of the faculty of the _carolinum_, doubtless he lectured occasionally, and certainly he preached daily. Thus Hooper had ample opportunity to hear Bullinger expound Reformed theology in a formal way.[3] But of equal importance were the innumerable private conversations they held in which Hooper's doubts and confusions were expressed and discussed.[4]

The relationship between Hooper and Bullinger was more than academic, it was also very personal. They were the closest of friends and consistently expressed the deepest concern for the welfare of the other. The joys of one were the joys of the other, and the sorrows of one were of grave concern to the other. The extant correspondence of the two men is abundant evidence of this fact. On March 29, 1548, a daughter, Rachel, was born to the Hoopers. Bullinger shared the honor with Rosilla Bibliander as god-parent to the child. In succeeding years Bullinger maintained a deep interest in the welfare of the child, constantly inquiring of her health, development, and spiritual growth. Upon Hooper's death several years later, Bullinger sought in vain to bring his widow and child to Zurich where he personally promised to care for their needs.

---

[1] _OL_, I, p. 48.

[2] _Ibid._, p. 64.

[3] We know something of the content of Bullinger's preaching in this period, for he makes reference to it in his _Diarium_, pp. 34-37. On Hooper's arrival in 1547, he was treating the apocalypse of Daniel. The year was concluded with a study of Zechariah. In 1548 Bullinger concerned himself with Isaiah, I and II Kings, the Acts of the Apostles, and finally the letter to the Romans. It should also be noted that it was in this period that Bullinger was preparing the first two _Decades_ which came from Froschover's presses in March, 1549. Here he deals with the nature of the Word of God, the essence of faith, and the meaning of justification by faith. He concludes with an exposition of the Lord's Supper and the Ten Commandments.

[4] Josiah Pratt (ed.), _The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe_, (8 vols.; London: George Seeley, 1870), VI, Pt. II, p. 675.

Zurich was also the scene of Hooper's first literary efforts. From the presses of Augustine Fries came three of his works. Early in 1547 Hooper issued a sharp attack upon Stephen Gardiner's defense of transubstantiation in his book, An Answer unto my Lord of Winchester's book entitled A Detection of the Devil's Sophistry, ... Late in the same year Hooper wrote a study in Christology, one of the few to appear in the sixteenth century: A Declaration of Christ and His Office. It bore a dedication to the Duke of Somerset, the Lord Protector of England. Finally, in 1548 Hooper's A Declaration of the ten holy commandments of Almighty God written in Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5. came from the press but was not bound and published until 1549 when Hooper returned to England.

Throughout this two-year period Hooper and Bullinger kept in close touch with affairs in England through numerous correspondents. Their special concern was the developing reformation within the Edwardian church.

Late in 1548 Hooper began to feel an urgency to return to England to help shape the emerging church. Foxe tells us that Hooper was "moved in conscience" to lend his hand to the reformation.[1] No doubt his conscience was prompted by letters from England chiding him of his duty and urging him to return.[2] Certainly the decision was not easy. Hooper was happy in Zurich and was content to remain there, as he frequently testified in later years. He consulted Bullinger on the matter. The "pros and cons" of such a move were analysed thoroughly. Hooper realized that ultimately his own life might be at stake.[3] He knew the character of the opposition he would face in England, and he knew of his own determination to stand for a radical reformation regardless of the consequences. Trouble was inevitable. No doubt Bullinger sensed the complication of Hooper's own intractable personality which would endure severe hardship rather than sacrifice principle. Truly the need in England was great for men of Hooper's quality, but how much would have to be sacrificed by men of Hooper's temperament! Nevertheless, Hooper decided to go. He believed his life not to be his own, but expendable for the God he served.

---

[1] Foxe's Acts, VI, Pt. II, p. 637.

[2] OL, I, p. 350.

[3] Foxe's Acts, VI, p. 675. In 1555 Bullinger wrote to Hooper this important comment as the latter was near his death: "Now is that thing happened unto you, my brother, the which we did oftentimes prophesy unto ourselves, at your being with us, should come to pass, ..."

Hooper's departure from Zurich has been preserved for us by Foxe in his Acts and Monuments.[1] As was the custom in Zurich, Hooper called upon Bullinger and others of his friends before taking his leave. Thereupon, Bullinger made a short speech.[2] He told Hooper that his leaving was Zurich's loss, and for this they were sad. But at the same time they rejoiced for he was returning home that Christ's church might fare the better. Hooper was asked not to forget his Swiss friends and was assured "that we will not forget our old friend and fellow master Hooper."[3]

Hooper's reply is moving and somewhat prophetic. One senses the great reluctance on Hooper's part to tear up the roots he had planted so deeply there. He expressed his appreciation for all the kindnesses shown to him and assured all of his friends gathered there of his love. To forget such friends and benefactors would be impossible. "And therefore you shall be sure from time to time to hear from me, and I will write unto you, how it goeth with me: for there . . . where I shall take most pains, there shall you hear of me to be burned to ashes."[1] And so it was that Hooper left Zurich on March 24, 1549.[2]

---

[1] Historical scholarship is vindicating the accuracy of this work. Certainly this scene in Hooper's life, though possibly apocryphal in some aspects, could be from a first-hand source--Bullinger. Foxe solicited Bullinger's aid for material to include in his martyrology. Bullinger would have been a logical one to give such a detailed account of this scene. See Zurich Letters, I, 26.

[2] Foxe's Acts, VI, Pt. II, p. 638.

[3] Ibid.

Hooper left Zurich armed for battle. The basic structure of his theology was formed. He had lived "among the people of God," and from them he knew the principles on which a "godly" reformation had to be built. He set his face toward England with the determination to expend himself, if necessary, for a reformation of that sort there. For support he could count upon his Swiss friends who would supply him with encouragement. But most of all they had promised to lend their hands actively to aid the cause. Surely Hooper felt himself setting forth on a great mission.

3. The Journey to England

Hooper, his wife Anne, their small daughter Rachel, their maidservant Joanna, and John Rudolph Stumph, a Swiss student on his way to England to study, formed the Hooper party. Four days after their departure from Zurich, they arrived in Basel where Hooper paused to write a letter to Bullinger.[3] (It should be noted that this was the second letter Hooper had sent to Bullinger since taking his leave.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Bullinger's Diarium, p. 37.

[3] OL, I, p. 48f.

The first one, which does not appear to be extant, was written at Dietikon, a small village not far from Zurich.[1]) Hooper related that he was discharging the wagon and driver which he had hired at Zurich, and was sending back to Bullinger by means of that man a sheet, blanket, and pillow which he had borrowed for the journey. He related the news that Strassburg had not yet fallen to the catholics though the bishop of that city was raging with madness and fury. As the Hooper party left Basel for Strassburg, they were joined by Martin Micronius, a Fleming by birth and physician by profession. He had been forced to flee Germany for his Protestant sympathies. In the months ahead he became a close friend of the Hooper family, living with them for a time in their London house. Later he became a minister of one of the Strangers' Churches in London.

Hooper and party arrived in Strassburg on March 29. On the second day Hooper wrote his third report to Bullinger.[2] He explained that since little Rachel was cutting teeth and was rather fretful, they would tarry there several days. Meanwhile he was listening to Hedio lecture, and reports that the latter preached a sermon in which he attacked the Suvermerians.[3] Hooper was not impressed and expresses ridicule at this absurd attack. He reported that because of the Interim, Paul Fagius had already left the city, and that Bucer was to leave that evening, but his destination was unknown. As we shall see, Bucer, too, was headed for England.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 57.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 50ff.

[3] The term "Suvermerian" is difficult to define. In England in this period it generally referred to the Eucharistic viewpoint of Geneva and/or Zurich.

The next communication Bullinger had from Hooper was dated April 8 from Mainz.[2] He related the perils of their journey and the inadequacy of their lodging and food along the way. The news from England was good. The king "is your brother, he worships the same God with yourselves, and, I hope, in the same manner."[3] Hooper expressed his great appreciation for Bullinger's letter written on March 26, which evidently reached him at Mainz. He gave great praise to Bullinger and Gualter for their diligence in caring for Christ's sheep in Zurich and throughout the world. In closing, Hooper requested some literature from Bullinger that might be used in the forth-coming battles that he would surely wage in England. He asked that a secretary be employed who would copy "the heads" of Bullinger's sermons, his "remarks" on the epistle to the Romans, Isaiah, and the other prophets. He also requested similar notes from Gualter and Bibliander.[1] A sufficient amount of money was left in Zurich for this purpose. Hooper urged that this be done immediately "that I, though distant, may benefit others by the gifts of God bestowed upon you."[2] Here we see again the respect which Hooper had for Tigurine theology, and his determination that that theology should find greater attention in England.

---

[1] Here is a small portion of the abundant evidence to refute A. Lang's (see his Puritanismus und Pietismus) contention that Hooper was greatly influenced by Bucer. The fact that Bucer was leaving that night for England and did not tell Hooper of his destination would indicate that there was no close friendship between them.

[2] OL, I, p. 51ff.

[3] Ibid., p. 53.

On April 8 Hooper paused in Cologne, after a long trip down the Rhine from Mainz, to write Bullinger the latest news of their travels.[3] Again he related that their journey has been haunted by misfortune and delay. The news from England was good: "The gospel of Christ our Lord is daily striking root more deeply."[4] Hooper urged Bullinger to receive the bearer of this letter, John Utenhove, with brotherly affection. He is recommended as a man illustrious both by birth and by virtues, "most sincere in the true religion, and entirely opposed to all the mischiefs of sectarianism . . . . His noble qualities and remarkable learning will sufficiently recommend him to all pious and learned men."[5] Utenhove was being sent to Bullinger for a reason: "that he may hear your godly sermons and theological lectures, and observe the mode of administering the Lord's supper, which as it is most simple among you, so it is most pure."[1] This statement is most important. Here we see how deeply Hooper drank of the Zurich tradition. "Simplicity" equals "purity." Hooper had learned well! This was also the lesson he would like to teach others, such as Utenhove, but more especially the English divines. Officially Anglicanism was not receptive to this view, but this seed planted by Hooper would later bear fruit in Elizabethan Puritanism.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 54.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 55ff.

[4] Ibid., p. 55.

[5] Ibid., p. 56.

Utenhove received a further recommendation from Hooper on April 26, 1549.[2] He urged Bullinger to "receive him with kindness. Moreover should there occur any mention of the holy supper of the Lord, diligently admonish and instruct him upon the subject; you will find no one more tractable, or more ready to learn."[3] Such urgency on Hooper's part certainly indicates his determination that Utenhove had to become a disciple of the Tigurine viewpoint and reflects his own convictions that Bullinger and Zurich represented the fount of evangelical truth. Bullinger received Utenhove with open arms. He replied to Burcher's recommendation of him in these fond terms: "That nobleman of Ghent, ab Utenhoven, far exceeded your commendation of him. He is without his equal, and I thank you that by your instrumentality and that of my friend Hooper, I have contracted an intimacy with one who is in every way so distinguished."[1]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., p. 57.

[3] Ibid.

From Antwerp Hooper also wrote that news had reached him that John à Lasco would not be in England upon his return, much to his sorrow. "I greatly regret his absence, especially as Peter Martyr and Bernardine[2] so stoutly defend Lutheranism,[3] and there is now arrived a third, (I mean Bucer) who will leave no stone unturned to obtain a footing."[4] Hooper's analysis of these who might be friends or foes in his mission ahead is interesting. That à Lasco, upon his return to England, would give him undivided support was true. That the others would refuse to side with him in his difficulties (though certainly not because of any Lutheran sympathies) would also prove true. Hooper saw clearly the dimensions of the mission before him. By May 16, the Hooper party had arrived in London.

---

[1] *Ibid*., II, p. 739f.

[2] Bernardine Ochino, an Italian reformer, who fled the inquisition in Italy along with Peter Martyr and was given asylum in England. See F. C. Church, *The Italian Reformers 1536-1564* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1932).

[3] Certainly Hooper was unfair in this judgment for neither Martyr nor Ochino were Lutheran in their theology or their sympathies.

[4] *OL*, I, p. 61.

4. Hooper at Work: May 16, 1549 - January 1, 1550[1]

Two weeks after his arrival in London, Hooper paused in an already busy schedule to write Bullinger a brief note.[1] He was already at the center of a controversy. In his study of the Decalogue, published immediately upon his return to England, he had expressed the opinion that both a husband and a wife had equal rights in suing for divorce on grounds of adultery. Hooper was challenged and a debate ensued. Though he knew Bullinger's opinion could not possibly arrive in time to help him, he asked that Bullinger in his next letter "either confirm my opinion, or correct my error."

We also learn from this letter that Bullinger had used Hooper's return to England as a means once again to communicate with men of influence there. A letter from Bullinger was carried to Cranmer, who obviously did not receive it with as much enthusiasm as Hooper had expected, for the latter commented, "he did not vouchsafe a single word respecting either yourself, or your most godly church."[2] Hooper believed the reason for this was that "Bucer has very great influence with him." A letter and books, probably Bullinger's recently published Decades, intended for John à Lasco were reported on their way to him on the continent. Hooper also carried copies of Bullinger's Decades to Richard

---

[1] Ibid., p. 64.

[2] Ibid.

Hilles[1] and Richard Cox.[2] Other copies of the Decades were distributed later upon the arrival of Hooper's trunks which had been delayed in passage from the continent.

On June 25, almost one month after his last letter, Hooper wrote again to Bullinger.[3] He thanked him for his recent letter which was most pleasing to him. Regarding English affairs, it was reported that sectarianism was springing up everywhere and Romanism still found strong support throughout the kingdom. If only there were more ministers to shepherd the flock. Hooper stated that he was doing his part. "I myself too, as my slender abilities will allow me . . . read a public lecture twice in the day to so numerous an audience, that the church cannot contain them."[4] Thus the mission was underway. Hooper was at work and his efforts were bearing results. Surely Bullinger was pleased. But Hooper's letter also expressed something of despair. He found no support from the hierarchy since Canterbury was still addicted to Bucer.[5] He lamented that Bullinger could not write in English so that his works could be read by the masses. "I doubt not but that God would convert many hearts to the knowledge of himself."[1] Hooper concluded with a longing once more to be in Zurich. Certainly he felt lonely as he struggled to make his witness against an overpowering opposition. He promised, however, to continue the fight, "as long as I can do so with a pure conscience."[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 266.

[2] Ibid., p. 119.

[3] Ibid., p. 65ff.

[4] Ibid., p. 65.

[5] Ibid., p. 67.

The next day Martin Micronius, Hooper's house guest in London, wrote a note to Conrad Pellican in Zurich. He confirmed Hooper's description of the turbulent state of affairs in England, but insisted that the true doctrine was receiving a hearing through such men as John Hooper. He reported that people were hearing him gladly and in great numbers. "But, good God, what a concourse of people, how many lives have been changed, . . . how many enemies of the gospel return to discretion. If the Lord God, in his great goodness, . . . increases his spirit in Hooper, I do not doubt but that he will be the future Zwingli of England."[3] In Tigurine eyes, what greater compliment could be paid to this man's efforts?

Throughout the summer and early fall of 1549, Hooper labored hard. His name became known throughout the kingdom for the earnestness and power with which he preached the gospel. Dr. Richard Smith, a contemporary Roman Catholic protagonist of Hooper's at Oxford, confirmed this judgment: "After he began to preach in London, about one or two years ago, he was so admired by the people, that they held him for a prophet, nay, they looked upon him as some deity."[1] It should also be noted that Hooper was receiving recognition in the leading circles of the land. In August he wrote to John Stumph stating that if he wished to contact him for any reason he should do so at the residence of the Duke of Somerset, the Lord Protector.[2] Others of the nobility also became friendly in the months to come.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Zentralbibliothek, Zurich, SC. S70:136 quoted in West, op. cit., p. 45.

In those months another controversy surrounded Hooper. He had been bold enough to criticize the eucharistic position of Martin Bucer in public, charging him with Ubiquitarianism. In August Bucer wrote to Calvin complaining of this charge: "This idea I have always reprehended: and yet J.H., an Englishman, who lately returned from Zurich into England, dared to spread the report publicly, that I maintained that Christ's body is everywhere as God. Such conduct does not proceed from the Spirit of God."[3]

On September 30, Micronius wrote to Bullinger in place of Hooper, who "has not sufficient leisure to allow of

---

[1] John Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials relating chiefly to Religion and The Reformation of it . . . , (3 vols.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1822), II, Pt. I, p. 66.

[2] OL, I, p. 68.

[3] Corpus Reformatorum, XIII, p. 350f. quoted in West, op. cit., p. 47.

62

his writing."[1] Hooper was reported to be "imposing upon himself a severe and constant labour in instructing the people, who are most numerous and attentive." He made the interesting comment that Cranmer was somewhat more favorably disposed toward Hooper, but no elaboration was given.

On September 1, Hooper lectured vigorously against the corporal presence in the Lord's supper, no doubt espousing the Zwinglian viewpoint, to which the bishop of London, Bonner, responded that same day at St. Paul's with a zealous defense of transubstantiation. Obviously the quarrel did not cease with that encounter, for we learn later that it was carried before the council.[2] This offense, coupled with others, caused Bonner's imprisonment. Hooper had no illusions as to the power of this man, who, if set free, could quickly cut short his mission. Later he commented to Bullinger, "Should he be again restored to his office and episcopal function, I shall, I doubt not, be restored to my country and my Father which is in heaven."[3] Thus for the third time in as many months, Hooper had raised a controversy.

Early in October Bullinger must have become concerned for Hooper's well-being. Possibly he was apprehensive simply because he had not heard directly from Hooper; possibly some report had come to his ears which concerned him. At any rate it would seem that he wrote to Burcher for any news of Hooper that he might have. Such would seem to imply Burcher's statement:

---

[1] OL, II, p. 557f.

[2] Ibid., I, p. 70.

[3] Ibid.

> No misfortune, that I am aware of, has happened to master Hooper; but, as I have been informed by a person worthy of credit, he is very busy in confuting Lutheranism, and planting the truth. He is performing the duty of an earnest Christian. He is giving public lectures in London, where he has a numerous auditory, and is praised by all good men.[1]

On the 7th of November Hooper wrote to Bullinger.[2] Things were not going too well. There was the possibility of an imminent change in religion due to the fall of Somerset. For a time silence was imposed on the clergy though in recent days it had been lifted. Hooper's lectures at the king's court were canceled. Would there be a reversion to a more conservative church program? Certainly Hooper believed that to be a distinct possibility. If so, what about his mission? Surely Bullinger was uneasy with the latest turn of events. Nevertheless Hooper was still planning for the future and again asked for some support from Bullinger in the form of his notes on Isaiah,[3] and anything else relevant to the prophets and the New Testament. The same was also requested of Gualter and Bibliander.[1]

---

[1] _Ibid_., II, p. 659.

[2] _Ibid_., I, p. 69f.

[3] Bullinger employed Haller to transcribe his notes which were sent off immediately in the hands of Hales. While crossing the channel, early in 1550, Hales' things, including the notes, were thrown overboard to make the boat lighter in order to escape French pirates. _OL_, I, p. 83.

A month later Hooper wrote again to summarize the existing situation.[2] Somerset was still in the Tower, and his fate was undecided. The religious situation was the same. "Although our vessel is dangerously tossed about on all sides, yet God in his providence holds the helm, and raises up more favourers of his word in his majesty's councils who with activity and courage defend the cause of Christ."[3]

There was good news, however. The Archbishop of Canterbury "entertains right views as to the nature of Christ's presence in the supper," and equally important, he was very friendly toward Hooper.[4] Hooper related that Cranmer had a series of articles to which ministerial candidates and lecturers in divinity had to subscribe. "In these his sentiments regarding the eucharist are pure, and religious, and similar to yours in Switzerland."[5] Hooper was happy with the theological stand of the archbishop and was now concerned merely that he have a "firm and manly spirit" to stick by the truth now that he had embraced it. Surely Bullinger must have been pleased with this word. His numerous epistles and books to Cranmer along with the prodding of individuals were producing results.

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 70.

[2] _Ibid_., p. 71ff.

[3] _Ibid_., p. 71.

[4] _Ibid_.

[5] _Ibid_., p. 71f.

But there was more good news. Hooper believed there were six or seven bishops "who comprehend the doctrine of Christ as far as relates to the Lord's supper, with as much clearness and piety as one could desire; . . . ."[1] Probably these were Cranmer of Canterbury, Ridley of Rochester, Goodrich of Ely, Farrar of St. David's, Holbeach of Lincoln, and Barlow of Bath.[2] However, he pointed out that these men were fearful of expressing their opinions and would not attempt to reform their churches for fear of losing their property. Hooper's listing of these men is important. It reveals that he had been talking with the leading men of the church, attempting to discover where they stood theologically. And as one would expect in the sixteenth century, the key doctrine was that of the eucharist. Thus we see that Hooper was pushing his mission also in personal interviews.

The reformation of church practice moved more slowly, reported Hooper. Nevertheless, there were changes. Altars were removed and replaced by tables. The term mass was being replaced by the word communion. The vernacular language was used instead of Latin. But there was a long way to go.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 72.

[2] Ibid., p. 76.

Vestments were still used, candles were placed on the altars, and chanting the "hours" and the hymns in worship was still the usual practice. So there were still "perils and anxieties" confronting the work in England.[1]

It was also his opinion that the work of Christ in England could greatly be aided if Bullinger would dedicate to Edward VI some treatise of his which was coming from the press. He pleaded that this injunction be passed on to Bibliander and Gualter also. We shall see later that Bullinger obliged his friend in this regard. Certainly Bullinger was fulfilling his obligation to aid the cause from his post in Zurich.

And so it was that 1549 came to a close. As Bullinger looked over Hooper's missionary undertaking to England, he could be happy with the progress that was made. Hooper had established himself in London and was preaching the gospel effectively and to large crowds. He had made contact with persons of influence and had won their confidence. Churchmen were taking notice of the Tigurine viewpoint. Six bishops could be named who held "right views" on the doctrine of the eucharist. Yes, advancement was being made. But no doubt Bullinger could also remember the three controversies which had revolved around Hooper in the past six months. In each Hooper was aggressive and confident. Wasn't more trouble, and even greater trouble, to be expected in the months ahead?

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. 72.

CHAPTER III

ANGLO-TIGURINE RELATIONS: 1547-1553

1. Background

On January 28, 1547, Henry VIII died and was succeeded by his frail nine-year-old son Edward. The balance of the council named by the late monarch to rule during his son's minority was promptly overturned, the Earl of Hertford (soon created Somerset) was appointed Protector, and the leading catholics were turned out. It became daily more clear that the Henrician reformation was to be carried still further. An even more radical policy was later espoused by Somerset's successor, the Earl of Warwick (later Duke of Northumberland).

Officially the young monarch inherited a church which was conservative in every way. The Act of the Six Articles (1539) set the theological tone, while liturgically the church still stood with Rome. For all practical purposes she remained the church she had been a half-century before, except that she rendered no allegiance to an authority outside her borders.

In 1547 the English Church comprehended two religious parties. Since the earliest days of Henry's reign there existed a strong Henrician party which wished reunion with the mother church and opposed any concessions toward reform. Stalwarts of this position were bishops Gardiner of Winchester and Bonner of London. Sensing that religious changes were imminent, they strongly protested on the ground that modifications could not legally be made during the king's minority. This they bolstered by ardently preaching the theology of Transubstantiation and other distinctively Catholic doctrines.

A second party within the church, growing in numbers, power, and prestige may be designated the Reform party. Influenced by the humanistic tradition and the writings of the continental Reformers, they wished to lead the Church of England into new paths. To be sure, this party was in no sense unified with a particular plan of action to pursue. On the contrary it was strongly diversified and individualistic. At one extreme it comprised such English clerics as Cranmer of Canterbury and Ridley of London (translated from Rochester in 1550); at the other were men like Hooper of Gloucester and Coverdale of Exeter. Lacking central leadership and coordinated plans of action, individuals within the party initiated principles of reform upon which they wished the Church of England to be reconstructed. A fundamental distinction between the extremes was not one of theology, but one of timing. Men of the Cranmer school were gradualists. They sought to institute reforms slowly and by every legal means available. Thereby the people could be educated gradually and brought to an acceptance of the changes. This the men of government also believed and adopted as their mode of procedure. Men of the other extreme, such as Hooper, desired a program of immediacy. They were firmly convinced that God hated corruption and perversion, and thus the church had to be purified forthwith. Hence their continual wrangling with those in authority over a half-way reformation. To their dismay, but possibly to the church's advantage, their pleas were unacceptable to the officers of government. Thus much of the disputation within the Reform party was provoked by the matter of timing rather than any doctrinal disagreement.

2. Foreign Theologians in England

In a previous chapter it has been shown how Bullinger, through a variety of means, deliberately attempted to influence the Henrician church. He was none the less diligent in the reign of Edward VI. As before, letters, books, and personal contacts were the media of his influence. One might legitimately ask: What was the incentive of motive in his efforts to influence the English Church? Like all Protestant Reformers of the sixteenth century, Bullinger was concerned that the church be purged of corruption, and that the purity of the primitive church be restored. Believing the Bible to be the sole authority for Christian life, thought, and practice, he wished the Church of England to take the Scriptures as its guide just as Zurich had done in decades past.

Thus only indirectly was he seeking a reformation compatible with that in Zurich. The fundamental thing was obedience to God's Word as found in holy Scripture. Only insofar as both churches conformed to God's Word would their reformations be similar. This was the authority and the impetus behind his energies directed toward England.

Cremeans has made the judgment that: "Of all the reformers, Bullinger was probably the most respected at that time [Edward's reign] in England."[1] Such a statement is a bit strong when one considers the significant contributions of Peter Martyr and Martin Bucer to English christianity in this period. To be sure Bullinger was their equal in influence and can therefore claim to have been as influential as any Protestant Reformer. Certainly the Lutheran influence was in utter disrepute by that time,[2] while the name of John Calvin was just on the horizon.[3]

It is the thesis of this study that within the Reform Party in Edward's reign, there existed an active and virile Tigurine party.[4] This party was composed of individuals who accepted in whole or in part the theological orientation of Zurich. That it was primarily a party of individuals must be emphasized. At no time did they act in concert under the leadership of one man. Certainly as individuals they had contact with one another and enjoyed a mutual fellowship as theological kinsmen. But in general they functioned as individuals, proclaiming the gospel, and winning converts according to their own determined plans. The only validity in calling them a party is that in one way or another they were theologically indebted to Zurich, and to the personal counsel and friendship of the Tigurine divines, especially Bullinger. Zurich was their common denominator for which they repeatedly gave expressions of praise and thanks.

---

[1] Charles Davis Cremeans, The Reception of Calvinistic Thought in England (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949), p. 30.

[2] See Henry Eyster Jacobs, The Lutheran Movement in England (Philadelphia: G. W. Frederick, 1894).

[3] Cremeans, op. cit.

[4] In the past historians have made reference to a "Zwinglian" influence in England in Edward's reign. While the term "Zwinglian" may be valid for conveying to the reader

The Tigurine party was not composed exclusively of Englishmen. To be sure, in 1547 no foreigners were numbered in their midst, but shortly thereafter a significant few made their way to England at the invitation of Cranmer. Soon after the accession of Edward, Cranmer conceived his project

---

the notion of a particular brand of theology and church reformation, it, nevertheless, is too narrow and limited. I prefer the term "Tigurine." This term has the advantage of conveying what is implied by "Zwinglian" plus the orientation of such men as Bullinger and the other Tigurine divines. The Church of Zurich made its impact upon England through many Tigurine citizens. Bullinger was first and foremost among them. But there were also such influential personalities as Gualter, Bibliander, Pellican, and Juda. It is impossible to say where the influence of any one of these men began and ended. All of them were Zwinglian in the general sense of the term. But more accuracy can be conveyed by the term "Tigurine."

for a Reformed Consensus and invited distinguished theologians from the continent to England for the meeting. Those of a Tigurine orientation who accepted the invitation were Bernardino Ochino, Peter Martyr Vermigli, and John à Lasco.

Bernardino Ochino's place in the English Reformation is unclear. Probably he was of minor importance, but as a spokesman of the Tigurine viewpoint he demands mention here. As a fugitive from his native Italy because of Reformation teaching, he eventually found asylum in England in December, 1547. He was a close associate of Cranmer who secured for him a prebend at Canterbury and the post of pastor to the Italian refugees in London. He fled the country upon Mary's accession in 1553. That Ochino was a devotee of the Tigurine viewpoint at this time is most likely. Certainly in June, 1555, when he took up residence in Zurich as minister to the Locarnese congregation he was "orthodox" in his theology. Zurich law demanded that a man assuming a post such as that offered to Ochino "must be tried [concerning his doctrine and fitness], and he must promise the other servants of the church to keep strictly to the customs and doctrines of the Zurich church, and he must take an oath to the Synod."[1] Ochino was readily approved and warmly received. Regarding the touchy issue of the sacraments, Ochino boldly asserted in the Westphal controversy: "His [Zwingli's] doctrine of the Sacrament is sincere, true, and pure. This is evident from God's Word, which he does not forsake by a hairsbreadth, ..."[1] To what extent the English Reformation benefited from his services is unknown. The very fact that he was a supporter of the Tigurine viewpoint and was welcomed into the highest circles of English church life is important. Cranmer, the architect of the Edwardian reformation, personally received him at Lambeth Palace where Ochino spent several months in residence. It goes without saying that between theologians, matters of theology were chiefly the topics of conversation. When we remember that at this time Cranmer was actively engaged in constructing the first Book of Common Prayer and drawing up the Forty-two Articles of Religion, we realize his possible importance.

---

[1] Karl Benrath, Bernardino Ochino, of Siena (New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1877), p. 226.

Peter Martyr Vermigli played a prominent role in the English Reformation. Arriving in England in November, 1547, Martyr immediately became a significant figure in English theological circles. As an intimate of Cranmer, with whom he was also housed for a time, he received several posts of importance. In the spring of 1548, he received an appointment as Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford from which chair he labored against great odds to overcome "the friends of popery." Writing to Bucer in 1548 he said, "If you knew by what fury, impudence and perverseness they [Romanists] are actuated, you would be astonished: . . . and indeed all men of this stamp seem to have agreed upon this one point, that they will say anything rather than bring their minds to entertain the clear and open truth."[1] Nevertheless Martyr's efforts at Oxford bore fruit. It is interesting to note the numerous students who followed him into exile upon Edward's death. Not the least of them was John Jewel, a youth extremely devoted to Martyr, who would make an important contribution to the Elizabethan church.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 237.

Martyr's prestige and importance is also revealed by other tasks of importance awarded to him. In preparation for the 1552 revision of the Prayer Book, Cranmer selected Martyr as one of a few from whom he wished an opinion of the 1549 Prayer Book.[2] His comments along with Bucer's Censura were important relative to the changes made. Also in 1552 it was Martyr who was selected by the crown to serve on a commission assigned to revise the canon law.[3] Strype reveals the outcome of the latter project: "These commissioners at last finished their great work; and the king lived not long enough to get it enacted; and so it fell, and that great labour frustrated."[4] Thus we see that in matters of great religious importance

---

[1] OL, II, p. 469.

[2] Gorham, op. cit., p. 231.

[3] Acts of Privy Council, III, p. 382.

[4] Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, III, p. 89.

Peter Martyr was looked to with great respect by leaders of the Edwardian Church.

Theologically where did Martyr stand? Joseph McLelland in a careful study of his theology[1] concludes that he stood within the Zwingli-Calvin school with more emphasis on the latter half. Especially on the "tell-tale" doctrine of the eucharist, McLelland insists he stood closer to Calvin than to the Tigurine school.[2] Certainly this was not what Martyr himself believed if we assume that Martyr knew what he believed personally and was able to assess the doctrine held by other theologians in his day. In 1549 Martyr was provoked into a debate at Oxford regarding the doctrine of the eucharist. Word reached Bullinger through John ab Ulmis, a Swiss student studying at Oxford, that Martyr had defended himself beautifully and had departed not "even a nail's breadth by that [doctrine of eucharist] entertained by yourself."[3] Bullinger wrote Martyr a letter of congratulations regarding the outcome of the debate. Martyr in turn replied with a letter stating: "You congratulate me upon the happy result of the disputations, which however is rather to be attributed to you than to me, since you have for so many years both taught and maintained that doctrine which I there undertook to defend . . . ."[1] It is significant also that when Martyr returned to the continent upon Mary's accession, it was to Zurich that he went although Calvin also extended to him an invitation to settle in Geneva. Surely Bullinger was not so theologically naive as to invite a man to teach his divinity students whose theology was not compatible with the doctrines of Zurich. Thus for the purposes of this dissertation Martyr shall be regarded as an example of the Tigurine viewpoint at work on the English scene.

---

[1] The Visible Words of God (London: Oliver and Boyd, 1957).

[2] Ibid., p. 278.

[3] OL, II, p. 388.

The third important foreigner of the Tigurine school to sojourn in England was John à Lasco. Because his life and influence were so closely bound up with the London Strangers' Churches, a later section of this chapter will be devoted to that study.

Apart from the three theologians just mentioned, there existed at Oxford a colony of Swiss students who were also adherents of the Tigurine viewpoint. In Edward's reign there were approximately ten of these students at Oxford.[2] If there were others we know nothing of them. Some studied there only for a few weeks or months while others spent several years and received degrees. It is interesting to speculate why Oxford was chosen for study in preference to

---

[1] Ibid., p. 476. See also OL, II, p. 497f.; 517f.

[2] John ab Ulmis, Henry ab Ulmis, Conrad ab Ulmis, John Stumphius, Christopher Froschover, Alexander Schmutz, Andrew Croariensis, Augustine Bernher, Albert Blaurer, and Walter Blaurer.

Cambridge. It would not seem unreasonable to suggest that the presence of Martyr at Oxford and Bucer at Cambridge were the determining factors. Martyr was known to be a close friend of the Zurich church, and theologically sound; whereas Bucer was regarded with great suspicion and known to hold a defective doctrine of the eucharist. That Bullinger was directly responsible for the students' presence at Oxford is most likely. Certainly their numerous letters indicate that they regarded him as their special patron and counsel. Bullinger also took a close personal interest in the students, acting as their advisor and counselor.

As a group the Swiss students made no theological impression upon English church life. John ab Ulmis, one of their number, however, needs special mention, for surely he was an ambassador for Tigurine theology. Although in the final analysis he exploited the latter for his own economic gain, the Tigurine party benefitted greatly from his activity. He set himself to the task of introducing influential Englishmen to Bullinger and other Tigurine divines and encouraged the latter to follow through on his leads. His success was noteworthy.

Upon his arrival in England in the spring of 1548, ab Ulmis carried with him letters of introduction to Bartholomew Traheron and Nicholas Eliot, old friends of Bullinger.[1] Since

---

[1] _OL_, II, p. 377f.

Eliot had died some time before, Traheron became ab Ulmis's sole entreé to the English scene. Traheron recommended to his charge that he abandon his studies and seek a post in the royal household.[1] Possibly that would have been his destination had not Richard Cox, Chancellor of Oxford, befriended him, and offered him royal patronage and support.[2] Through Cox, ab Ulmis made his important friendship with the marquis of Dorset who awarded him a yearly stipend for his study at Oxford.[3] The friendship between ab Ulmis and Dorset was doubly secured by a letter of commendation to the marquis from Bullinger.[4] That ab Ulmis became an intimate of the Dorset household seems clear, for we find him frequently spending his holidays with the royal family. In this setting he was befriended by Richard Skinner and John Wullock, tutors to the marquis's daughter, Jane Grey. From the outset ab Ulmis spoke to them of Bullinger and the Tigurine church and assured his listeners that Bullinger held them personally in high regard. (The truth was probably that Bullinger had never heard of them!) This was the beginning of a long friendship. At ab Ulmis's suggestion Bullinger showered the Dorset family and tutors with letters and books. As we shall later see, the marquis was honored with the dedication of Bullinger's fifth Decade. Letters are extant which show that Bullinger's attention was not unappreciated. The entire Dorset household praised Bullinger and the Tigurine church and showed a basic appreciation and sympathy for Tigurine principles. That a man of Dorset's prominence and influence should be won to the Tigurine viewpoint is significant for he was a privy counsellor and therefore influential in affairs of state.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 382.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 384f.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 389.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 389f.

Bullinger's relationship to Dorset's daughter, Jane Grey, is worthy of comment. Through both her tutors and her contacts with ab Ulmis, Jane Grey came to know Bullinger. Ab Ulmis wrote on November 11, 1550, that he had translated Bullinger's treatise on Christian marriage from German into Latin and made a present of it to Lady Jane.[1] She in turn rendered "a good part" of it into Greek and presented it to her father for a New Year's gift.[2] In May, 1551, ab Ulmis informed Bullinger that Jane Grey had written him a "learned" letter wherein she expressed veneration and esteem for him.[3] He added the interesting comment that it was rumored that this young girl was to be betrothed to the young king Edward. Excited by the prospect, he concluded, "How beneficial to the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 421f.

[2] Ibid., p. 427.

[3] Ibid., p. 430.

Church!" Having caught the image, Bullinger set about to enter into a personal correspondence with the lady himself.

Sometime in the late spring of 1551, Bullinger wrote his first letter to Jane Grey of which we learn in her reply dated July 12.[1] Her letter to him was profuse in its praise of his wisdom and piety. She described him as "a skilful, prudent, and godly counsellor; one who can relish nothing that is not excellent, think nothing that is not divine, enjoin nothing that is not profitable, and produce nothing that is not virtuous, pious, and worthy of so reverend a father."[2] In conclusion she requested his advice on the most profitable way to pursue the study of Hebrew.[3] In the subsequent months Bullinger wrote again admonishing the young lady to be devout in the Christain faith, to study diligently the pure Word of God, and to follow certain rules for the study of Hebrew. Conrad Pellican, also at ab Ulmis's suggestion, offered Jane Grey advice on the latter point.[4] Over the next two years, through correspondence, Bullinger sought to advise this girl on a variety of matters relative to the Christian life.

In July, 1553, Edward VI died. Through the frantic efforts of Northumberland, to avoid the accession of Mary, Jane Grey was proclaimed Queen of England. But Mary, the rightful heir, had the support of the nation, and the government of Jane Grey collapsed. Being led to her execution, she removed her gloves and had them forwarded to Bullinger as a token of her faith in the Word of God and her debt to him as her spiritual counsellor. So far as can be ascertained Jane Grey had no personal influence upon English church life. However, she serves as an excellent example of what the Tigurine party was able to accomplish in Edward's reign.

---

[1] Ibid., I, p. 4.

[2] Ibid., p. 5.

[3] Ibid., p. 7.

[4] Ibid., II, p. 431f; 451f.

John ab Ulmis can be credited with introducing two other members of the Dorset household to Bullinger: James Haddon and John Aylmer. In the spring of 1551 Skinner and Wullock received appointments in other parts of the kingdom. Haddon, thereupon, became chaplain to Jane Grey and Aylmer became her tutor.[1] Through ab Ulmis a correspondence soon developed between these men and Bullinger. Especially did Haddon find in Bullinger a close friend whose advice he sought for many years to come. Thus John ab Ulmis was responsible to a large degree for the spread of Tigurine thought and influence among the aristocracy of English society.

3. John à Lasco and the Strangers' Churches

As early as 1539 religious refugees sought asylum in

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 431.

England from the armies of Charles V in Flanders.[1] To the dismay of the emperor, Henry VIII granted them refuge. Their numbers in these early years were small, but as the measures of Charles V became more repressive, the number of exiles became proportionately larger. By the end of the year 1548, it was estimated that there were over five thousand Germans in London,[2] not to mention hundreds of other nationalities.

The first congregations of refugees were formed in December, 1548. In that month a colony of French exiles formed themselves into a church in Canterbury.[3] Their leaders were Jan Utenhovius, Francois Perroussel, and Claudius Colineaus. At the same time another French colony formed a congregation in London with Richard Vauville as pastor. The numerous auditory of Germans in and about London had some difficulty in finding a man to lead their congregation. Both Ochino and Bucer were prevailed upon to write to friends on the Continent who might come to England for that purpose.[4] However, their efforts were futile until John à Lasco concerned himself with their cause in the early summer of 1550. Through the labors of à Lasco, Cranmer, and

---

[1] G. B. Beeman, "The Early History of the Strangers' Church, 1550 to 1561." Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of London, XV (1933-1937), p. 262.

[2] OL, I, p. 336.

[3] Smyth, op. cit., p. 191.

[4] OL, I, 334; OL, II, 538.

Hooper, the Council authorized that a "temple" be prepared at royal expense which would house the varied congregations of foreigners in London. John à Lasco was appointed superintendent with Walter Deboemis, Martin Flandrus (Micronius), Francis Riverius (Francois Perroussel) and Richard Gallus (Vauville) as ministers. The letters patent were granted on July 24, 1550.[1] The building housed Flemish, German, French, and Walloon congregations. Early in 1551 an Italian congregation was also formed under à Lasco's superintendency. Its pastor was Michael Angelo Florio.

The importance of the Strangers' Churches cannot be appreciated apart from the background and theological orientation of John à Lasco and his associates.

John à Lasco[2] was born in 1499 in Poland of an influential noble family. His paternal uncle was archbishop of Gnesen, Primate of Poland, and later Papal Legate and Chancellor of the kingdom. Through the latter's influence, à Lasco was well educated in the humanistic tradition. From 1524-1525, he studied at Bologna, and at Basel under Pellican (at that time still a cleric in the Roman fold) and Erasmus. Through pressure from his uncle, he was forced to return to Poland (Sept. 1525) to absolve himself from suspected sympathies with the reformation. In 1531 he was appointed Provost of Gnessen and Leczyc, and then Bishop of Vesprin. All the while he nurtured a desire to see the reformation succeed. Finally in the summer of 1538 he renounced his office and left the church to join the Protestant cause.

---

[1] Calender of the Patent Rolls, Edward VI (6 vols.; London: Published by His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1924-1929), III, 317.

[2] See Smyth, op. cit., pp. 180-226, for an excellent biographical sketch.

He wandered over the continent for several years, finally settling down in 1543 as the superintendent of the Protestant community in Emden. In this setting his theological orientation became fixed. Most significantly, he absorbed the sacramentarian view of the sacraments which prevailed there.[1]

In 1544 he made his first contact by letter with Bullinger. He wrote, "I ardently love you and therefore am anxious for all my [works] to be approved by you . . . ."[2] Bullinger answered with what Smyth calls "an unpleasantly fawning reply," and also presented him with a copy of his *De auctoritate verbi dei, & De officio et functione praelatorum ecclesiae*.

In April, 1545, à Lasco wrote a letter to a friend setting forth his sacramental theology. Six years later he inserted that letter as a preface to Bullinger's *Absoluta de Christi domini et catholicae ejus ecclesiae sacramentis tractatio*, the publication of which he was supervising in

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 182.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 182f.

England. The preface was appropriate for it shows that these two men were in complete agreement upon this significant issue. Indeed this was the very purpose for appending the letter to the treatise. À Lasco wrote to Bullinger on June 7, 1551: "I have subjoined to it [Bullinger's treatise] one of my Epistles, written on the same subject six years ago, that I may give proof that we agree in our doctrine."[1] Thus it was that à Lasco came to England in the fall of 1548 as a devotee of the Tigurine viewpoint.

Early in 1548 Cranmer conceived of the possibility of bringing together in England the greatest minds of the Protestant world in order to arrive at a consensus of evangelical thought "that all posterity may have a pattern to imitate."[2] Those invited included Melanchthon, Calvin, Bullinger, Bucer, Martyr, and à Lasco. In September, 1548, à Lasco took temporary leave of his ecclesiastical responsibilities in Emden and headed for England, arriving there sometime in the third week of that month. For the next six months he was a constant associate and companion of Cranmer.

Early in 1549 it became obvious that Cranmer's desire for a Protestant "Council" was not to materialize in the near future. Hence à Lasco made his plans to leave England to assume his responsibilities in Emden. By March 19, he was at work once again. At the same time Charles V intensified the pressures to bring East Friesland under the demands of the Interim. À Lasco was forced to flee the land. He journeyed to Prussia where the Duke of that territory appointed him to the Prussian diplomatic corps. In May, 1550, à Lasco was sent to London on his first mission. He arrived in London on May 13,[1] and set to work. He and his entire family received papers of denization on June 27.[2] It was at this point that his career and the future of the Strangers' Churches met.

---

[1] George Cornelius Gorham, Gleanings of a Few Scattered Ears during the Period of the Reformation in England and of the Times immediately succeeding; AD 1533 to AD 1588 (London: Bell and Daldy, 1857), p. 264.

[2] OL, II, p. 560.

One of à Lasco's associates in the work of the Strangers' Church was Jan Utenhovius, a nobleman of Ghent. He fled his native country in 1544 to escape persecution and settled in Strassburg after a period of wandering. We have already seen that he was in England in the latter months of 1548 as the pastor of the French refugee church in Canterbury. In the spring of 1549 he was once again on the continent where he encountered Hooper who was on his way to England after his two year sojourn in Zurich. Hooper persuaded his old friend to go to Zurich where he would find the gospel purely preached and the sacraments purely administered and interpreted.[3] Hooper was most anxious that Utenhovius be given special attention by the Tigurine divines and wrote two letters to that end to Bullinger.[1]

---

[1] OL, II, p. 560.

[2] Calendar of the Patent Rolls, III, p. 316.

[3] OL, I, p. 56.

Bullinger received Utenhovius warmly.[2] Indeed he stated in a letter to Burcher (June 28, 1549) that Utenhovius "far exceeded" the recommendations of him. There is evidence that his affection for him lasted for many years, for Utenhovius constantly received greetings from Bullinger whenever the latter wrote to his numerous friends in England. Utenhovius likewise held Bullinger and the Tigurine church in high regard. In several letters he expressed to Bullinger his complete devotion to him.[3] Hooper volunteered the information to Bullinger: "Master Utenhovius dutifully salutes your worship, and doubtless aids you all in his diligent prayers to God. You would be quite astonished, did you know how many times he has thanked me for having sent him to Zurich."[4]

Though there is no direct evidence that Utenhovius was a theological disciple of Zurich, there is little doubt that theologically he stood within that tradition. Surely his closest friends--à Lasco, Hooper, and Micronius--upheld that viewpoint, and as was obvious in the sixteenth century, only birds of a "theological feather" flocked together. Burcher, in a letter to Bullinger (June 1, 1549), speaks of Utenhovius' theology: "He does not disagree with us in point of religion, and is moreover a man of learning and of godly judgment . . . . He is a disciple of the French Church, the doctrine of which is not different from our own."[1] Thus another leader of the Strangers' Church can be numbered among those sympathetic to the Tigurine viewpoint.

---

[1] Ibid., I, p. 56; I, p. 57.

[2] Ibid., II, p. 739f.

[3] OL, II, pp. 583-604.

[4] OL, I, p. 85.

Finally we must take a look at the pastor of the German congregation under à Lasco's superintendency. His name was Martin Micronius (Flandrus). Micronius, like Utenhovius, was a native of Ghent. As a young man, he was educated in medicine, but was forced to abandon his practice in 1544 when his obvious sympathies with the Reformation became known. He left Germany with Utenhovius and settled in Basel. It was here that he became friendly with Hooper when the latter took his leave of Zurich. He journeyed to England as a member of the Hooper party and resided with the Hooper household in London for several months.[2]

Micronius was a diligent correspondent of Bullinger's. Especially was he prompt in reporting to the Tigurine divine the latest news about Hooper who was so embroiled in controversy that he had no leisure to write. When he assumed the leadership of the German congregation, that body along with the other stranger congregations was being rocked with heresy. Micronius wrote to Bullinger for assistance. "I was desirous . . . to lay these things before your reverence, that . . . you may be pleased to write me word what may fitly be replied to these . . . . You, who are our fathers, teachers, and guides in the reformation of the churches, will not grudge affording us your advice and instruction, that we might rightly direct the Church of God, and fortify it against all heresies."[1] It is also probable that prior to this time Micronius visited Zurich and had personal contact with Bullinger.

---

[1] _Ibid_., II, p. 654.

[2] _Ibid_., II, p. 572.

Thus three of the prominent leaders of the Strangers' Church in London were sympathetic to Tigurine theology. That their theological orientation dominated the thought of these exiles is probable. Certainly the problems confronting the Strangers' Churches in Edward's reign and the way they were handled theologically gives further evidence of their allegiance to the Tigurine tradition. We have already observed that on July 24, 1550, the Church of the Strangers was established by letters patent. The wording of the patent is significant and was the source of much controversy for many months. It states that the church is awarded to the Strangers in order that they might hold worship "according to the Word of God and the Apostolic observance."[2] It was also provided that together these foreign congregations should form "a body politic," thus placing them outside the ecclesiastical control of the Church of England. Both issues provoked a storm. Bishop Ridley of London was especially angered that an independent church was permitted to flourish in his diocese. The great majority of the bishops supported him. No doubt, it was the influence of Cranmer and Hooper which won the ear of the Council and secured the establishment of these as autonomous congregations. But the issue of significance for us here is a theological one. No doubt à Lasco and the other ministers agitated for the right to establish congregations which would conduct themselves in all matters "according to the Word of God and the Apostolic observance." The amazing thing for the Anglican churchmen was the obvious implication that church practice in the Anglican Church was somehow impure or inferior because it did not adapt to this criterion. Otherwise the strangers could have fitted themselves into the Anglican scheme without any difficulty. That the Strangers actually had such a feeling about Anglican worship is explicitly found in a letter written by Micronius to Bullinger. When it appeared that some restrictions might be put on their free use of the sacraments, Micronius was disconsolate. He feared they "might be fettered by the English ceremonies, which are intolerable to all godly persons."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., II, p. 574f.

[2] Calender of Patent Rolls, III, p. 317.

---

[1] OL, II, p. 573.

The church life of the Strangers was, indeed, different from that practiced in the established church. Biblical preaching was at the heart of their church life. "In fact in any kind of assembly whatever, some sermon from Scripture is preached which seems most to the point."[1] It was consistently pointed out that sermons must reflect the pure Word of God and under no circumstances can be shaped "by human traditions or histories, or by the subtleties of philosophers."[2] Thus the sole authority of Scripture was expounded in a vigorous way.

We have already seen that the Strangers were susceptible to a great variety of heretical teachings. Indeed this was one of the reasons why the crown was concerned to organize these peoples in some way as to check this tendency. The young monarch stated explicitly in his diary that the Strangers' Churches were formed, "for avoiding of all sects of anabaptists and such like."[3] À Lasco and his fellow-ministers were faced with the responsibility for restoring pure doctrine among their fellow-exiles. To that end they instituted a procedure which they called Prophecy. À Lasco readily admitted that the device was selected because the "Order of Prophecy in the Church of the Germans appears to be of the greatest usefulness to the whole Church."[1] The details of this program need not concern us here. It is sufficient to state that it was a weekly meeting of clergy and laity wherein the ministry was held accountable for the content of its preaching. In this way, if questionable doctrine were preached, the laity could demand clarification and the clergy in turn could answer. Needless to say, everything had to be "agreeable to the word of God." Through this dialogue à Lasco saw several profits accruing to the church[2]: (1) "The souls of the whole church are strengthened to preserve and guard sound doctrine"; (2) "Listlessness and idleness on the part of the Ministers of the Word are shaken off"; (3) "Many people are won over, who have been drawn to other sects through ignorance"; (4) "The door is shut to inflexible and obstinate opponents and to all sects." The fact that à Lasco designated this liturgical practice as Prophecy reminds us that Zurich also had a program titled Prophezei. The question arises: Did the Strangers' Church borrow their practice from Zurich? In the first place, in point of structure the two are not similar. The Zurich prophezei was basically an educational endeavour wherein students and scholars discussed academic theological problems. The role of the laity was passive--merely a reception of the conclusions reached in scholarly discussion. In the Strangers' Churches laity and clergy together worked at discovering Christian truth. In the second place, Zurich _prophezei_ had as its purpose the training of the clergy and students of the ministry in the fundamentals of the Christian faith. In the London refugee congregations _Prophecy_ was a procedure whereby pure doctrine was retained in the churches and heresy excluded. On the other hand, the two programs shared in the same name. Surely the necessity of the times in both cases dictated the structure and the purpose behind the respective programs. Certainly it is likely that the idea of a _Prophecy_ was implanted in the minds of the refugees through contact with the Zurich practice, but its ultimate goal was dictated by the needs at hand. In any case, it was not antithetical to Tigurine thought and practice.

---

[1] Bard Thompson, "Reformed Liturgies in Translation: Selections from à Lasco's Liturgy," Theology and Life, I (May, 1958), p. 107.

[2] Ibid.

[3] "The Journal of King Edward's Reign written with his own hand," in Gilbert Burnet's The History of the Reformation of the Church of England (3 vols.; Dublin: A. Rhames, 1730-1733), Appendix, Part II, Book II, p. 13.

---

[1] Thompson, loc. cit., p. 107.

[2] Ibid., p. 109.

The eucharistic rite composed by à Lasco and used by the Strangers' Church also needs mention. Significantly, Thompson has pointed out that the rite is "Reformed but not quite Genevan."[1] Indeed, it stood more in the Zwingli-Farel tradition. Throughout, the sense of the Communion as a memorial predominated. It is not accidental that the Scripture specifically assigned to be read in the service was the gospel of John, Chapter VI.

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. 107.

Outside their own communal interests, the "true colors" of the Strangers' Church were reflected in the religious controversies of the day. In Hooper's controversy with the Church over the ordinal and the vestments, the Strangers were his unflinching ally. À Lasco alone among the major continental theologians in England was Hooper's ardent and active supporter. Letters to Bullinger from Micronius and Utenhovius consistently made reference to the controversy and reveal their complete support for Hooper and his cause. The Anglican form of episcopal ordination was described as "manifestly impious."[1] English ceremonies with their use of vestments were condemned as "intolerable to all godly persons."[2] When Hooper was forced to bow to ecclesiastical pressure and accept consecration in the prescribed habit, Utenhovius was obviously displeased. Utenhovius wrote to Bullinger: "He [Hooper] was inaugurated in the usual manner, about the middle of Lent, yet not without the greatest regret both of myself and of all good men, nor without affording a most grievous stumbling-block to many of our brethren."[3] Doubtless their support of Hooper rested on their belief that the worship of God must be biblically based. Here the Church of England erred for it permitted accretions to the worship of God; such blasphemy had to be attacked.

---

[1] OL, II, p. 571.

[2] Ibid., p. 573.

[3] Ibid., p. 586.

From this discussion it is obvious that the Strangers' Churches shared a close theological kinship with the church of Zurich. Certainly its leaders owed a great deal theologically to Bullinger and other Tigurine divines. This, coupled with a strong bond of friendship between the two churches, validates the assertion that the Strangers' Churches stood as monuments to the Tigurine tradition in England. And there can be little doubt that English churchmen and ministers of government saw them for what they were. À Lasco reported an interesting comment allegedly made by the young king himself. He stated that Edward was concerned that the Church of England undergo a more radical reformation, and to that end he favored the establishment of the Strangers' Churches "that by this means the English Churches also might be excited to embrace the Apostolical purity . . . ."[1] That the king ever made such a comment is rather doubtful; that à Lasco and others of the Tigurine party thought of them in such terms is quite likely.

4. Bullinger's Literary Influence in the Edwardian Period

Books and letters were important media through which Bullinger sought to influence the English Church in Edward's reign. We have already seen that in Henry's reign, Englishmen were introduced to Bullinger by these means. Edward's reign witnessed a concerted effort on his part to make them even more effective. Through extant correspondence we know that Bullinger was in contact with at least twenty-five Englishmen concerning matters of one variety or another in this period. Many of the letters indicate that Bullinger took the initiative in seeking out his correspondents. The latter, in turn, were appreciative of his favor, for Bullinger was held in high regard by Protestant churchmen throughout Europe. Englishmen wrote him of their church problems, sought his advice on theological issues, and urged him to use his good offices to effect a more thorough reformation of their church. In all these matters Bullinger was diligent to lend his aid.

---

[1] William Carruthers, "Edward VI. Granting a Charter to the Presbyterians," The Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society of England, I (May, 1914), p. 18.

Bullinger's books came into the hands of Englishmen through two principal sources: (1) English booksellers, and (2) direct gifts from Bullinger himself.

There is no way to estimate the sale of Bullinger's Latin treatises in England in this period. That they were in the hands of English booksellers cannot be doubted.[1] Several letters to Bullinger indicate that his books were on sale and in great demand.

One of these treatises published in England in this period needs discussion. By the spring of 1546, Bullinger had completed a manuscript on the theology of the Lord's Supper titled Absoluta de Christi domini et catholicae ejus ecclesiae sacramentis. It did not go to press, however, until five years later, since Bullinger feared that by its publication he would resurrect the supper strife with the Lutherans.[1] In the meantime, Bullinger sent copies of it to his friends for their opinions. À Lasco was one of them. For three years the latter kept the manuscript in his possession. Finally while residing in England, he decided, without Bullinger's knowledge, to publish it. In a letter to Bullinger, à Lasco reported the following significant comment: "I showed it [the manuscript] to my Lord of Canterbury, who on hearing that it was not yet published, expressed his wish that it should be published even though he had not read it, adding this,--that "your books needed no inspection."[2] The book came from the presses in April, 1551, bearing a dedication to Princess Elizabeth. It also bore a preface which was in reality a treatise on the Lord's Supper. Composed by à Lasco, it reveals the unanimity of thought between himself and Bullinger on this issue. Meanwhile, in Zurich, Bullinger was completing the fifth volume of his Decades wherein he proposed to deal at length with the sacraments. From his earlier manuscript on the supper he selected certain portions which became chapters six through nine of the fifth Decade.

---

[1] Gorham, op. cit., p. 262.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 246f.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 247f.

In the period of our study, eight of Bullinger's works were translated into English and thus became available for the common reader. In 1547 Miles Coverdale translated and had published Bullinger's The Olde Faith (Antiquissima fides et vera religios). The translator indicated that he was setting forth this study to correct those who assert that reformation teaching is "new-fangled." "Wherefore . . . I have here set forth this book: partly, because it sheweth the antiquity and ancient age of our holy Christian faith, and partly, to give occasion unto all such as have received it, not to be ashamed of it, nor to shrink from it."[1] New editions were printed in 1581 and 1624.

In 1548 two private letters--one each from Bullinger and Calvin--attacking the Roman mass were translated and published for general consumption under the title Two Epystles, one of Henry bullynger, wyth consent of all the learned men of the Churche of Tygury: an other of Johan Calvyne, chefe Preacher of the Church of Geneve . . . . The general intent of both letters was to show from scriptural sources that the mass was the invention of the papacy and contrary to God's will. Thus a Protestant Christian could not conscientiously frequent the mass without offending God. Another edition was published in 1550. The year 1548 also saw the translation and publication in English of Bullinger's An holsom Antidotus against the Anabaptistes. The translator, J. Veron, dedicated the work to Edward VI and the Lord Protector Somerset. Edward's reign was consistently plagued by the rise of numerous sectarian groups in all parts of England. In common parlance they were given the generic name of Anabaptists though it is doubtful that many of them would have found common fellowship with the original Anabaptists of Switzerland. From his earliest days at Kappel, Bullinger had been an ardent foe of the Swiss Anabaptists. Several treatises came from his pen attacking their faith with great virulence. The book under consideration here was one of them. In all probability this book was published in England as a means of combating the growing sectarian movement.

---

[1] George Pearson (ed.), Writings and Translations of Myles Coverdale ("The Parker Society," Cambridge: The University Press, 1844), p. 5f.

The year 1549 saw the publication of Bullinger's A Treatise or Sermon . . . concernynge magistrates and obedience of Subiects. In reality this was the ninth sermon of the second Decade which had been published in Zurich in March of that year. Doubtless the translator and publisher, by issuing this essay, sought to ease the tensions which were erupting in England in the summer and fall of that year.

In 1550 the German concordance to certain editions of the Zurich Bible was translated into English under the title A briefe and compendiouse table, in a maner of a *concordance openyng the waye to the principall histories of the whole Bible*. Bullinger was only one of the Tigurine divines who collaborated in its original publication.

The year 1551 saw the publication of another of Bullinger's anti-Anabaptist tracts, *A most necessary and frutefull Dialogue, betwene ye seditious Libertin or rebel Anabaptist, and the true obedient Christia-, wherein . . . ye shall se ye excellencie and worthynesse of a Christia magistrate . . .* . This tract was a translation of extracts from the Latin edition of Bullinger's *Von dem unverschampten Frafel der Widertouffer*. In all probability sectarian disturbances provoked the issuance of that treatise and the following one which came out in the same year: *A most sure and strong defence of the baptisme of children*.

Finally, mention must be made of Bullinger's study in Christian marriage, *The Christian State of Matrimonye*. It was first translated by Miles Coverdale and published in 1541. Three new editions appeared in the last six years of Henry's reign. Edward's reign witnessed another new edition (1552) and three reprints. The sub-title adequately explains the line of thought pursued:

> The orygenall of holy wedlock: whan, where, how and of whom it was instituted and ordeyned: what it is: how it ought to proceede: what be the occasions, frute and commodities thereof. Contrary wyse, how shamefull and horrible a thinge whordome and aduoutry is . . . and how maried folkes shulde bring up their children in the feare of god.

The Decades

On the other side of the channel Bullinger personally sought to make his literary efforts effective in England. We have already seen that in March, 1549, at the time when Hooper was returning to England, Bullinger's first two Decades were coming from the Zurich presses.[1] These volumes were only two of a projected five volume series which would cover the chief doctrines of the Christian faith in fifty theological sermons. As sermons they had the practical value of being preachable; at the same time they offered deep insight into the Christian faith as scholarly essays. Their theological content will be considered in the succeeding chapter.

Hooper carried with him upon his return, several letters and copies of the first two Decades as gifts from Bullinger to several Englishmen of both high and low estate. Those receiving the Decades were Richard Hilles,[2] a merchant, and Richard Cox,[3] cleric and tutor of the king. John à Lasco[4] was sent a letter and a "book and writing." In all probability the book was a volume of the Decades. Cranmer was honored with a letter,[5] and though there is no mention of it, it seems most likely that a copy of the Decades was sent to him also.

---

[1] Bullinger, Diarium, p. 36.

[2] OL, I, p. 266.

[3] Ibid., p. 119.

[4] Ibid., p. 64.

[5] Ibid.

One year later in March, 1550, the third Decade and the first two sermons of the fourth Decade came from the press in Zurich.[1] Several months before, Hooper had written Bullinger urgently requesting him to dedicate some treatise to Edward VI, believing that such a favor would be helpful to the Reformation cause in England.[2] Bullinger complied with the dedication of his latest Decades to the young monarch. The tone that Bullinger struck in the epistle dedicatory is significant. Realizing that great religious change was taking place in England, he challenged the king to remember that peace, prosperity, and happiness of a king and kingdom are the product of obedience to God's holy word.[3] "It is assuredly true . . . confirmed by the testimony of the most true God, and in express words pronounced, that the prosperity of kings and kingdoms consisteth in true faith, diligent hearing, and faithful obeying the word or law of God: whereas their calamity and utter overthrow doth follow the contrary."[4] Specifically in relation to the reformation of the church, Bullinger urged the king to imitate the action of Josiah in the Old Testament:

---

[1] Bullinger's Diarium, p. 37.

[2] OL, I, p. 73.

[3] Decades, II, p. 5.

[4] Ibid.

> Now the scripture, which cannot lie, doth point out to our eyes the faith and obedience which he did devoutly shew to the word of God, for which that felicity did accompany his kingdom. He was nothing moved with the admonitions of his father Ammon's councellors; but so soon as he had heard the words of the law read out of the book . . . he straightway committed himself wholly to God and his word. Neither stayed he to look for the minds and reformations of other kings and kingdoms; but, quickly forecasting the best for his people, he began to reform the corrupted religion, ... And in that reformation he had a regard always to follow the meaning of holy scripture alone, and not to give ear to the deeds of his predecessors, to the prescribed order of long continuance, nor to the common voices of the greatest multitude.[1]

In April, 1550, Bullinger sent complimentary copies of this latest publication along with letters to his friends in England.[2] John Burcher, Bullinger's English intermediary in Strassburg, was his agent. The letter and book destined for the king preceeded the others "lest that which might be more acceptable from its rarity should become less so from being made common."[3] On the 22nd of April it was presented by the courier to Hooper who three days later carried it to the king.[4] In keeping with the law of the land, the book was handed to a royal counsellor, the Marquis of Northampton, who in turn presented it to the king in Hooper's presence.

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 10.

[2] _OL_, II, p. 662.

[3] _Ibid_.

[4] _Ibid_., p. 560.

Hooper later wrote to Bullinger of the scene: "He [Edward VI] received them with the greatest courtesy and kindness, and not without many thanks; for he most earnestly inquired both respecting yourself and the welfare of your church . . . . The king ordered me to salute you on every account in his name, and present his thanks, entreating you to remember him in your prayers, and to commend to God both himself and his kingdom."[1] Copies of the Decades were also distributed to Hooper,[2] Hilles,[3] Cox,[4] and Traheron.[5] Personal letters also accompanied each of these gifts.

On August 22, 1550, John ab Ulmis, one of the Swiss students at Oxford, wrote Bullinger that the third Decade of sermons had been translated into English by Thomas Caius and published.[6] Later that year he also volunteered the information that Warwick, the Lord Protector of England, "undertook that your works, numerous as they are, should be translated into English at his own expense."[7] Probably there is no truth in the latter statement. Certainly, if the works were translated, they were not published. Most likely ab Ulmis was hoping Bullinger would dedicate a treatist to Warwick who in turn would financially assist ab Ulmis.

---

[1] Ibid., I, p. 88f.

[2] Ibid., II, p. 662.

[3] Ibid., I, p. 269.

[4] Ibid., p. 89.

[5] Ibid., p. 323.

[6] Ibid., II, p. 415.

[7] Ibid., p. 422.

In August, 1550, the remaining eight sermons of the fourth Decade came from the press thus completing that Decade of sermons.[1] The completed volume was dedicated to Edward VI. As in the past several complimentary copies were hurried off to England with accompanying letters.[2] A letter and a copy of the book were presented to the king through Hooper. The king received them "with the greatest satisfaction."[3]

As has already been indicated, the Swiss student, John ab Ulmis, diligently promoted any avenue which might augment his financial status in England. As early as August, 1549, he urged Bullinger to dedicate some book to the Marquis of Dorset, a patron of students and an intimate of the royal household.[4] Even before mentioning the proposal to Bullinger, ab Ulmis had the nerve to speak to the Marquis about it, who in turn assured his charge that "nothing will be more acceptable to him."[5] Probably Hooper believed the idea to be a good one also and encouraged Bullinger to follow through.[6]

---

[1] Bullinger's Diarium, p. 38.

[2] OL, II, p. 673.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., p. 393.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid., I, p. 77.

"You will not a little advance the glory of God by giving encouragement to him and others by your writings."[1] After months of consideration, Bullinger acquiesced. In March, 1551, the fifth Decade was published in Zurich with a dedication to the Marquis of Dorset.[2] In keeping with ab Ulmis' request, the copy intended for the Marquis was sent him for the presentation. Ab Ulmis traveled to Scotland where the Marquis was sojourning to present the gift. Ab Ulmis later reported the scene:

> I presented it to his lordship in a numerous assemblage of persons . . . . I understand it was much approved by all, especially by the bishop of Norwich, Thomas Thirlby, an Englishman, very learned, and on the most intimate terms with our marquis. I wish you therefore to be thoroughly assured that this your courtesy has been honorably and deservedly bestowed upon this great and illustrious nobleman. At that time much inquiry was made of me respecting yourself, your habits of life, your children, and, in fine, all your household; but most especially as to what gift or present I thought would afford you most pleasure. But I constantly made answer to the marquis, that your only desire was that the doctrine of the Son of God might be advanced, the ruined house of God restored, and the tyranny of the pope condemned, ...[3]

Copies of the fifth Decade were also presented to Richard Cox,[4]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Bullinger's Diarium, p. 38.

[3] OL, II, p. 429f.

[4] Ibid., p. 428.

John Cheke,[1] Warwick,[2] Peter Martyr,[3] Jane Grey,[4] Wullock,[5] Skinner,[6] Hooper,[7] Hilles,[8] and Traheron.[9]

Numerous other references in extant letters indicate that many other of Bullinger's treatises made their way into England as gifts of their author. Almost invariably they were presented to men of influence, i.e., men who through a direct or indirect means, could effect a greater reformation of the Church of England. Records for this period are inadequate to give a proper estimate of Bullinger's literary influence on England, but there can be little doubt that it was another important medium by which his name and theology entered England.

5. Hooper and the Edwardian Religious Struggles

a) Introduction

In the previous chapter consideration was given to the formation of the intimate friendship between Hooper and

---

[1] Ibid. Sir John Cheke was tutor to King Edward VI.

[2] Ibid. Lord Protector of England, 1549-1553.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid. Jane Grey was the daughter of the marquis of Dorset.

[5] Ibid., p. 429. Andrew Wullock was a tutor to Jane Grey.

[6] Ibid. Robert Skinner was a tutor to Jane Grey.

[7] Ibid., I, p. 96.

[8] Ibid., p. 272.

[9] Ibid., p. 325.

Bullinger, and especially to the inception of Hooper's mission in England. In the spring of 1550 Hooper became the center of a religious controversy which propelled the Tigurine party and its principles of church reform into national prominence. For months the controversy raged with Bullinger lending his aid in support of Hooper at every possible turn. The details of that struggle must now engage our attention.

On February 5, 1550, Hooper wrote an extensive letter to Bullinger[1] summarizing his first year's work in England. Mid-way in his writing, Hooper was summoned by Cranmer who ordered him in the name of the king and council to preach before the king once a week during the ensuing Lenten season. Resuming his letter, Hooper indicated that he was thinking of preaching on the book of Jonah, "which will enable me freely to touch upon the duties of individuals."[2] He requested Bullinger's advice as to what should be said to such an important congregation. Surely Hooper considered this a great opportunity in his mission, and he had to make the most of it. Here was his chance to plead for a reformation in keeping with proper principles. In conclusion Bullinger was asked to dedicate anything which might be coming from the press to the Marquis of Dorset. The latter was described as "pious, good, brave, and distinguished in the cause of Christ."

---

[1] Ibid., p. 74ff.

[2] Ibid.

By so doing the glory of God would be enhanced and encouragement given to all. Bullinger himself, Hooper reported, had an excellent reputation in England. In a postscript Hooper again urged Gualter, Bibliander, and others of Zurich to dedicate anything they might be publishing to the king or to some member of the nobility. Bullinger especially was entreated to honor the king with a dedication.

This letter is significant apart from the important ecclesiastical news just related. It reveals the unity of concerns, both important and trivial, between the two men, and thus gives an insight into the depth of their friendship. For example, Hooper related news of his father whom he had not seen since his return, explained that the air of England was detrimental to his wife's health, expressed fatherly pride in the linguistic abilities of his two-year-old daughter (!!), and urged Bullinger to care for his health. Throughout their correspondence, one finds this great variety of concerns. Obviously their friendship was more than simply a theological one.

Upon Hooper's departure Bullinger had promised to aid his cause whenever possible. Thus in March he took Hooper's requests seriously and sent letters to Richard Cox and Edward VI.[1] In that same month his third Decade and the first two sermons of the fourth Decade came from Froschover's press with a dedication to the English king.[1]

---

[1] Bullinger's Diarium, p. 37.

On March 27, Hooper wrote Bullinger another report.[2] Fearing that his previous letters had not reached their destination, he used the introductory lines to summarize personal news and ecclesiastical events of the past months. He believed that he had made progress in instructing the people in the principles of a true reformation. He expressed hope that the appointment of Ridley to the sequestered bishopric of London would be a boon to his mission.[3] Even with his support, he lamented, the first would be difficult since use of the Book of Common Prayer (1549) was mandatory. Hooper described the latter as "very defective and of doubtful construction, and in some respects indeed manifestly impious."[4] In complete frustration he confided to Bullinger that he was so offended by that book, that, "if it be not corrected, I neither can nor will communicate with the church in the administration of the [Lord's] supper."[5]

He reported further that he was lecturing on the gospel of John, chapter eight. In the weeks past he had taught on chapter six wherein he gave a proper interpretation of the Lord's Supper. These lectures were attended by a great body of persons who understood and appreciated them. Nevertheless from certain quarters he incurred great opposition which Hooper truly believed to be dangerous. This same subject he was also "handling" before the king and council in his Lenten sermons on Jonah.[1]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] OL, I, p. 78ff.

[3] Ibid., p. 79.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid.

The latest news related to the publishing of an ordinal which was approved by the bishops and instituted as an official rite in the church. Hooper expressed great opposition to it, describing it as a means of promoting the kingdom of antichrist.[2] He was especially displeased with the oath to the king's supremacy which prescribed swearing by God, "the saints and the holy Evangelist."[3] This, too, he condemned in his lectures before the king and council which in turn resulted in hostility toward him from many quarters. Especially did the Archbishop of Canterbury denounce him with great severity. Thereupon Hooper pleaded with his hearers to listen to what authority he cited for his position. He thought he had won his point for he concludes, "At length the end and issue was for the glory of God."[4]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 80.

[2] Ibid., p. 81.

[3] Joseph Ketley (ed.), The Two Liturgies . . . in the reign of Edward VI ("The Parker Society;" Cambridge: The University Press, 1844), p. 169. There was no opposition on Hooper's part to the oath itself, but with the authorities cited within the oath.

[4] OL, I, p. 81.

This was a critical period in Hooper's mission. It marked the beginning of his open criticism of church-approved practices. Before this his contentions had been primarily theological, but now they were moved into the more delicate area of church life. Hooper had raised a storm and incurred the wrath of the bishops. On the surface it would appear that he won the argument. Certainly Hooper thought so for he wrote in this same letter that Cranmer was his friend once again.[1] But the opposition of the bishops remained. Hooper was on the eve of his greatest conflict yet.

Again Hooper requested Bullinger's support through the dedication of some of his works to the English nobility. (This was too early for Hooper to know that Bullinger had dedicated his latest Decades to King Edward VI.) He especially commended the Marquis of Dorset as worthy of a dedication. Gualter and Bibliander were entreated again to dedicate something to the king, to the duke of Somerset, or to the earl of Warwick, the new Lord Protector, whom Hooper described as "the most faithful and intrepid soldier of Christ."[2] Hooper testified that if it had not been for Warwick, when Somerset fell five months previously, he would not have had any future.[3] He also requested that Bullinger write letters of encouragement to the king, Warwick, and Dorset. Hooper expressed the precariousness of his situation when he insisted that Bullinger send letters to him by trustworthy carriers, "such is the envy and hatred of some parties, that if they see a letter addressed to me they will retain it."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 82.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 83.

In late April encouraging news of Hooper reached Bullinger from John Burcher in Strasburg.[2] "The name of Hooper is celebrated throughout all England. He is appointed a royal preacher, and is an opponent of Lutherans and Bucerians, but a constant defender and promoter of the true faith. His praise is universally proclaimed both on account of his innocency of life and strictness of discipline."[3]

b) The Vestiarian Controversy

Hooper preached his first Lenten sermon before the king and council on March 19, 1550;[4] six more would follow, one on each of the succeeding Wednesdays. These sermons are important to us for two reasons. First, we discover in explicit statements what Hooper conceived to be his role in England and the place of these sermons in fulfilling that role. Second, they reveal the type of reformation which Hooper wished to see instituted in England.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., II, p. 662ff.

[3] Ibid., p. 662.

[4] William M. Engles, Writings of Dr. John Hooper ("The British Reformers"; Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1842), V, p. 93.

Hooper considered himself a prophet to the English people. In a land filled with darkness and half-truth, he looked upon himself as the bearer of light which if followed would dispel that darkness. "As touching myself I am called unto this place to cry aloud; in case I do not, I know all the blood of these Jonahs [persons who do not fulfill their God-given vocations] will be required at my hand; which God forbid."[1] Thus Hooper's mission to the English was a prophetic one.

The key to Hooper's concept of reformation is found in his sixth sermon: "Let us submit ourselves, all our wisdom and learning, unto his word; and think that what Christ and his Apostles have instituted and used, can in no wise be bettered by us."[2] Apostolic Christianity was the norm by which the Christian church was to be ordered. If it is not apostolic, it is foreign and impure. If it is not apostolic it is imperfect and therefore blasphemous. "And here we are admonished . . . that we offer no other worship and religion unto God than he himself by word requires. If we do, we offer an idol of our own head, and honour the devil under the person and name of God, ..."[3]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 116.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 173.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 106.

With this rule as his guide Hooper declared what was amiss within the Church of England and asked for its reformation upon the principle previously stated. In the first place he insisted that the king's subjects were not fulfilling the vocation assigned to them.[1] For example, the bishops and priests of the realm were not fulfilling the God-given duty laid upon them of preaching the faithful doctrine of Christ. Instead they sang and said mass in the congregation of God. "Like thieves and murderers, they do the abominations commanded by man with massing, conjuring the holy water bucket, and such like, ..."[2]

In the area of liturgy Hooper expressed great annoyance at the recent publication of the ordinal wherein ordinands had to take an oath "swearing by God, the saints, and the holy gospels." He expressed his opposition in these strong terms: "In weighty matters, to swear by any thing, except by God, is no less an offence [than sin]."[3] As to the Lord's Supper Hooper had some concrete suggestions. First, suggestions as to the physical setting:

> The outward preparation; the more simple it is, the better it is, and the nearer unto the institution of Christ and his apostles. If he have bread, wine, a table, and a fair tablecloth, let him not be solicitous nor careful for the rest, seeing they are not things brought in by Christ, but by popes; unto whom,

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 108.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 123.

116

> if the king's majesty and his honourable council have good conscience, they must be restored again; and great shame it is for a noble king, emperor, or magistrate, contrary to God's will, to detain and keep from the devil or his minister any of their goods or treasurers, as the candles, vestments, crosses or altars! For if they are kept in the church as indifferent things, at length they will be maintained as necessary things.[1]

Regarding the behaviour of the communicant himself, Hooper says:

> The outward behaviour and gesture of the receiver should be without any kind of suspicion, show, or inclination of idolatry. Wherefore, seeing kneeling is a show and external sign of honouring and worshipping, and heretofore grievous and damnable idolatry has been committed by the honouring of the sacrament, I would wish it were commanded by the magistrates, that the communicators and receivers should do it standing or sitting. But sitting, in my opinion, were best, for many considerations.[2]

In good Tigurine fashion Hooper opposed the wearing of priestly vestments by the clergy. This opinion, as we shall soon see, threw him head-long into the hottest battle of his career. In these sermons he comments:

> As for the vestments of the priest in the ministry, I would wish the magistrate to remove them, for they either show or do not show virtue. If they show not, they use them in vain: if they declare and show virtue, either the virtue is with them indeed, or absent. If he that wears them has the virtue, why does he show it to the world. If he has not the virtue, then he is a hypocrite, whom God hateth.[3]

All of this Hooper declared in unequivocal terms before the governing ministers of the land, both political and ecclesiastical. Nor did he hesitate to declare at whose hands this reformation must take place. "The magistrate . . . may offend, if he, in case he see his subjects oppressed, will not defend them, as Abraham did his nephew Lot. This battle he is daily bound unto,--to war against vice, and to punish sin; . . . ."[1] "Give heed therefore, most gracious lords, to punish these Jonahs, and to put better in their places; or else God will punish either with evil beasts, or with sword, or with famine, or with pestilence, as it is written Ezekiel XIV. But in case you will do it, the sea will cease to rage, as I pray God it may."[2]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 170.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 172.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 176.

Hooper's criticism of the Church of England in 1550 is most interesting. First it indicates how thoroughly he was indoctrinated with Tigurine thought. The authority for his criticism--God's word and the Apostolic Church--and the criticisms made, all would have been made by the Tigurine Church and on the basis of the same authority. When we remember, too, that Hooper spent two of his most formative years in Zurich, there can be little doubt as to the source of his preaching. It should also be noted that the criticisms made by Hooper in these sermons would have been in complete accord with the thought of later Elizabethan Puritanism. The first decade of Elizabeth's reign witnessed the same rebellious attacks based on the same authority. Thus to some degree the origins of Puritanism are traceable to Hooper, or better yet, through Hooper to Zurich.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 122.

[2] Ibid., p. 129.

The first news that Bullinger had of the court's reaction to Hooper's sermons came from Micronius, writing from London on May 20.[1] He stated that he was writing in place of Hooper who was so busy that he had no leisure to write. The Lenten sermons were preached before the king "with the greatest freedom, and attended with great advantage. Only he stirred up some lazy noblemen and bishops against himself, especially because he exhorted the king and council to a more complete reformation of the church."[2] Such a reaction was inevitable. Hooper had preached bluntly and upon an issue of great moment. Especially his caricature of the bishops was not likely to go unchallenged. In spite of all, Micronius reported that Hooper was offered the bishopric of Gloucester on April 7.[3] Yet he pointed out that Hooper refused to accept it, unless it were offered to him "without any superstitious ceremonies," meaning in this case, omission of the oath in the ordinal, and the abandonment of episcopal vestments in the service of ordination.

---

[1] OL, II, p. 558ff.

[2] Ibid., p. 559.

[3] Ibid.

On May 15, Hooper was called before the king and council[1] to explain his objections to the vestments. Here he found the bishops arrayed against him. Hooper argued that the wearing of vestments was a matter of indifference, that is, the wearing or the failure to wear a prescribed apparel was unimportant. Therefore in matters of this sort the church should not force a man's conscience but permit the private convictions of the individual their freedom. Thus Hooper believed he was at liberty to refuse to wear them. In their turn the bishops took strong exception to this reasoning but due to the influence of Somerset[2] were forced to agree that vestments were matters indifferent and thus Hooper won his point and his bishopric. The official records state simply, "At Grenewiche the XVth. Maye 1550. Mr. Hooper was constituted Busshop of Gloucester."[3]

News of this victory reached Bullinger from several sources,[4] along with the significant comment by John ab Ulmis, "I never saw or heard any one who spoke more piously and with greater kindness respecting Switzerland, and especially your Church."[5] Surely Bullinger must have found the news hard to believe. Against the bishops Hooper had waged battle and had won, but only because of non-clerical support in the Council. Thus the lines were drawn. As long as Hooper had support from sections of the nobility, he and his mission were secure. If the bishops ever won the ascendancy, danger would result.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 466.

[2] Ibid., p. 410.

[3] Acts of the Privy Council, III, p. 31.

[4] John ab Ulmis to Bullinger, OL, II, p. 410; John Stumphius to Bullinger, OL, II, p. 466-67; Martin Micronius to Bullinger, OL, II, p. 560.

[5] Ibid., p. 410.

Hooper received some unexpected support in his mission with the sudden return to England of John à Lasco in May, 1550.[1] As we have seen, à Lasco was a Zwinglian in his theology, and a close friend of Cranmer's. Thus he could aid Hooper in his cause by his influential position in England.

Micronius's letter of May 28,[2] to Bullinger would indicate that Hooper's victory was not as secure as it was previously thought to be. There had been a turn of events within the Council. First, Hooper was presented by some members of the Council with a set of articles for his approval. He took exception to three of them. Especially did he oppose the one which stated that the sacraments confer grace; instead of this verb he preferred "seal or testify to."[3] The second development was even more baffling: "the book [of Common Prayer] set forth by the bishops must be diligently observed in every particular, without any alteration whatever."[4] And third, Hooper's approval of the ordinal, which had been the heart of the earlier controversy, was now demanded.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 560.

[2] Ibid., p. 562ff.

[3] Ibid., p. 563.

[4] Ibid.

Possibly an explanation for this abrupt change in policy is to be found in a letter from Peter Martyr to Bullinger dated June 1.[2] Martyr argued that "the business of religion" in England is making progress, yet slowly because of many limitations, the chief being "the worldly prudence of some parties who think it quite right that religion should be purified, but are willing only to make as few alterations as possible; for feeling as they do, and thinking as civilians, they consider that any great changes would be dangerous to the state."[3]

When Hooper finally wrote Bullinger in late June,[4] he gave no hint that the earlier controversy was not completely settled. He recounted the facts of the controversy which Bullinger had already received from other sources. The fight had not been easy. "Unless his [Christ's] loving-kindness had assisted me, I should very often have looked back from the plough since I begun. I could not have imagined that the office of preaching was exposed to so many and such painful anxieties."[5]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., p. 481.

[3] Ibid., p. 482.

[4] OL, I, p. 86ff.

[5] Ibid., p. 88.

In answer to a suggestion in one of Bullinger's previous letters, Hooper stated: "As to your advice in your letter, that I should make friends of the bishops, I should be much to blame, if I did not endeavour by all means to do so, provided it can be done with a safe and pure conscience."[1] This would seem to indicate that Bullinger realized that Hooper's great opposition stemmed from the bishops, and that if his mission in England was to be a success, this antagonism would have to be overcome. Hooper was first and foremost a man of principle. A principle he would not sacrifice under any circumstance, especially to make friends with the bishops. Hooper was never a man who could appreciate a compromise. As we shall see, Hooper was on the verge of scuttling his mission when he refused to compromise in face of episcopal opposition.

In conclusion Hooper requested more ammunition from Zurich. He desired "all the works of Zwinglius, your own, those of Bibliander, Pellican, Gualter, Oecolampadius, Gesner, both his Bibliotheca and the treatise on birds."[2] Specifically from Bullinger he wanted "your notes on Isaiah, on the book of Kings, and on the epistle to the Romans, from the beginning of the thirteenth chapter to the end."[3] This was Hooper's last letter to Bullinger for over a year.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 89.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 90.

In July the issue between Hooper and the bishops reached a crisis. On the 3rd the patent for the bishopric was issued and Hooper was ordered to appear before the Council on the 20th for its confirmation. The young king in examining the oath noticed that it still retained the phrase requiring swearing by the saints. Whereupon, he became quite excited and said, "What wickedness is here, Hooper? Are these officers ordained in the name of the saints, or of God?"[1] Thereupon, Hooper stated his views upon the subject, and the King erased the offending words. Thus Hooper would be able to take the oath in good conscience. A letter was issued by Warwick to Cranmer on the 23rd stating the king's wish that in the consecration "you would not charge this said bearer [Hooper] with an oath burdenous to his conscience."[2]

The only problem then remaining was the requirement that a bishop must wear a garment appropriate to his office. This, too, Hooper opposed. He was successful in obtaining a letter from the King to the Archbishop of Canterbury omitting the necessity of the prescribed dress for the service of ordination. Cranmer had designated Nicholas Ridley, bishop of London, for the consecration, and thus directed the letter to him. Ridley, though a supporter of reformation, stood with the opposing bishops in rejecting Hooper's request in this matter.[1] He maintained that the prescribed dress for ordination was voted by law of parliament and therefore no letter from the Council could override it.

---

[1] Ibid., II, p. 416.

[2] Foxe, op. cit., VI, p. 641.

Thereupon Hooper returned to the Council stating Ridley's refusal to comply. Again the Council acquiesced in Hooper's request and ordered his consecration without "superstition." A letter went forth from the king on August 5, to the Archbishop and other bishops demanding compliance.[2] Faced with this order Ridley promised an answer soon, either to Hooper personally or to the Council.

Shortly Ridley appeared before the Council stating his reasons for not complying with their request. He agreed with Hooper that the wearing of episcopal garments was a matter indifferent and therefore the wearing of them or failure to wear them was not pertinent to man's salvation. Precisely for this reason, Ridley argued, the church had the right to regulate such things as a means of promoting orderliness and decency within the church. Thus Hooper should be forced to comply with what had been legally decreed.[3]

This argument seems to have convinced the council that

---

[1] OL, II, p. 567.

[2] Foxe, op. cit., VI, p. 640.

[3] OL.

Hooper was creating a problem where one did not exist. So upon his return to them, they refused to hear him. Hooper, thereupon, asked to put his arguments in writing for the council to read. It was granted to him.[1]

Sometime in August, 1550, Hooper submitted his arguments to the Council. Again the Council, through Warwick, insisted on conformity maintaining that the king must be obeyed in matters indifferent. It was also argued that a stumbling block must not be placed in the way of the weak. Thus as Paul permitted himself to be shorn and allowed Timothy to be circumcised, so the episcopal vestments could be worn without committing offence to God.[2]

In reply to these arguments Hooper submitted on October 3, extensive "Notes" to the Council setting forth his case.[3] This document is interesting for two reasons. First, it reveals that Hooper had changed his stand on the vestments. No longer did he regard them as matters indifferent.[4] He had accepted the arguments of Ridley that matters indifferent are legitimately subject to regulation by the civil authority. Therefore, he set about to prove that vestments are not matters indifferent and therefore without the bounds of regulation. At this point he had difficulty. The entire treatise is a maze of contradiction and confusion. Taken as a whole, it hurt Hooper's cause, since Ridley very easily was able to point out its inconsistencies and thereby to show how confused Hooper was on the matter. Certainly this was not sufficient ground for permitting Hooper leniency in the matter.

---

[1] OL, II, p. 567.

[2] Ibid., p. 571.

[3] I take issue with Hopf (Journal of Theological Studies, XLIV, p. 195) and others who see these "Notes" as being those submitted by Hooper when the Council no longer would hear him after being convinced by Ridley. Hooper's "apology" written for that occasion was submitted in late August. (See OL, II, p. 567.) Warwick, as just stated, answered these objections. Hooper's "Notes" are submitted in response to Warwick's reply.

[4] Constantine Hopf, "Bishop Hooper's 'Notes" to the King's Council," Journal of Theological Studies, XLIV (July-October, 1943), p. 196.

In the second place, these "Notes" are important for the theological orientation they reveal of the author's mind. Taken sentence by sentence we find Hooper's belief in biblical authority, the simplicity of the primitive church as normative, the freedom of individual judgment, and even the suggestion that the Church is not subject to civil control. It is important to remember in studying this document that Hooper was writing in the midst of controversy and certainly with his back against the wall. Hence we must not be surprised to find statements that he would have repudiated if studied theological reasoning had been possible. Nevertheless, his statements indicate a firm foundation in Reformed theology, but more important, they point to the reasons and reactions typical of later Elizabethan Puritanism.

Three days after the presentation of this document to the Council, that body called Ridley before it and demanded that the controversy be brought to an end. Ridley asked permission to put in writing his reply to Hooper's "Notes." This was granted to him.

During those months Bullinger received communications from several sources relative to Hooper's situation. Most significant are the letters of Martin Micronius who was still a guest in Hooper's house. Though Micronius pleaded with Hooper to write Bullinger, he refused to do so stating that he was "determined to be silent until the settlement of this business . . . ."[1] Thus Micronius took it upon himself to supply Bullinger with the authoritative account of Hooper's condition. On October 13, he wrote[2] stating the fear that no longer did Hooper struggle against the bishops alone, for the nobility had joined the opposition and Hooper appeared to be isolated in his cause.[3] In conclusion, he wrote that Hooper had just called upon him and related that on the previous day Ridley had appeared before the Council against Hooper, impugning his doctrine, and loading him down with the greatest insults.[4] Yet he assured Bullinger that "Hooper remains steadfast in his opposition to all the relics of popery."[5] Surely Bullinger was grieved to have this news of his friend. No doubt he wished there were some way he could help. In another month a specific suggestion was to be made.

---

[1] OL, II, p. 566.

[2] Ibid., p. 570ff.

[3] Ibid., p. 573.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid.

By mid-October Hooper felt his isolation. A showdown was imminent, and as things stood, Hooper knew he was likely to be crushed in the process. He had one last chance: Could he win to his side those important theologians, Peter Martyr and Martin Bucer, whose influence in England at this time was great? A try was imperative. Thus on October 17, Hooper wrote letters to these men,[1] sending with the letters statements of his position on the vestments and the reasoning behind them. In the letters he requested that they study his comments, and if they believed his "cause to be just," please to signify the same unto him.

Martyr penned a long reply from Oxford on November 4.[2] Because of its importance here and in later English history, we must examine its content closely. Martyr stated that at first he was overjoyed at Hooper's zeal to make everything within the Church chaste and pure. "For what ought to be more desired of all godly men, than that all things may by little and little be cut off which have scarcely anything or nothing that can be turned to solid edification, and which by godly minds are rather considered to be redundant, and, in a manner superfluous?"[1] Thus in the ultimate goal Martyr was in agreement with Hooper. However, he was not at all certain that the things Hooper was attacking nor his reasons for attacking them were sufficient for concluding them to be "fatal or in their nature contrary to the Word of God . . . ."[2] Vestments, he argued, are matters indifferent, and although they be grievous and burdensome, they should be accepted lest by contending against them too strongly, the real advancement of the Gospel will be retarded. England is in an elementary state of religion. It is difficult enough to introduce the "necessary heads of religion." These, first, should be firmly grounded. Later the things indifferent should be removed.

---

[1] George Cornelius Gorham, Gleanings of a Few Scattered Ears, during the Period of the Reformation in England and of the Times immediately succeeding (London: Bell and Daldy, 1857), p. 185.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 187-196.

Bucer's reply to Hooper (ca. 9th November) reflected much the same argument.[3] He desired the removal of the vestments, but he strongly opposed Hooper's contention that they were "so contaminated [by Roman Catholicism], that they can be suffered in no church, ..."[4] The principle he would employ in this case, he stated simply: "It is evident that our Lord Jesus Christ, as regards the ministry, and the word, and the Sacraments, has prescribed to us in His own words, only the substance; and has left this church at liberty to order every thing else which appertains to the decent and useful administration of His mysteries."[1] Nevertheless, because the abuse of the vestments prevailed in England, it is his desire that they be abolished.[2]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 187.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 187.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 200-209.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 203.

A comparison of these two letters is interesting. In the final analysis neither Martyr nor Bucer could take his stand along-side Hooper on the issue at hand, but for different reasons. Martyr's judgment rested upon the premise: what is most expedient for the moment? Accept a few reforms now and tolerate some corruption (vestments being a part of it) with the expectation that tomorrow the ultimate goal will be reached? Or a grand sweep of reformation now with no immediate compromise possible? Martyr chose the former but the ultimate goal was the same as Hooper's--a church patterned on the New Testament. Only the means differed. Bucer, on the other hand, approached the problem from a completely different premise. The Bible merely supplies the "substance" of church practice; the church--tradition--has complete authority to supply the details, which are adiaphora. Here in a microcosm was reflected the great struggles which would rock the Elizabethan Church--the clash between two irreconcilable authorities.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 204f.

[2] Ibid., p. 208.

Hooper's last hope for influential support was now gone. He stood alone except for the support of à Lasco and the Stranger' congregations. Two weeks later (ca. December 1) he received an order from the Council commanding him to keep his house unless it were to go to the Archbishop of Canterbury of the bishops of Ely, London, or Lincoln "for counsaill or satisfaccion of his conscience in that matter."[1] He was further restricted from preaching or expounding the Scriptures.

In the meantime Bullinger received a letter from his old friend Burcher who had just returned from England to Strassburg.[2] Burhcer's word regarding Hooper's situation obviously was not enthusiastic. He suggested to Bullinger that "it would not be out of place, if both parties were reminded of their duty by yourself and the leading preachers of the truth of the present day . . . . Or you might more conveniently state your opinion to the king respecting profane ceremonies of this kind."[3] From Burcher's next letter to Bullinger dated December 28,[4] we learn that Bullinger had answered Burcher's previous letter in haste inquiring whether the latter was serious regarding his suggestion. Burcher, in reply, assured him that he was most serious. "This evil . . . may easily be either removed or mitigated by your authority, and that of your church, if you will write the king."[1] In conclusion he offered the advice: "I do not, however, consider it either necessary or expedient for you to write expressly upon the matter now in dispute; but only as to what ceremonies may be allowed in the church, and to what extent; lest you might probably seem to have been suborned by Hooper to write on his behalf."[2]

---

[1] Acts of the Privy Council, III, p. 191.

[2] OL, II, p. 672.

[3] Ibid., p. 673.

[4] Ibid., p. 674.

In England matters became progressively worse. Violating the spirit of the council's command, Hooper published on December 20, a confession of his faith titled: *A godly Confession and Protestacion of the Christian Faith*. The popular interest generated by the controversy is illustrated by the fact that this small volume passed through two printings in the last ten days of 1550. In the midst of this crisis Hooper wrote Bullinger a brief note filled with despair and gloom.[3] Doubtless he believed the climax to be near, and the outcome not to his advantage.

---

[1] *Ibid*.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 675.

[3] I am indebted to Professor Fritz Blanke of the University of Zurich for the discovery of this letter. It is printed in the *Original Letters* as a part of a postscript to a letter dated August 1, 1551 (I, p. 95). The editor, in transcribing these letters, inadvertently took this brief note to be a part of the postscript to a letter on the preceding page of a folio in the state archives of Zurich.

Angered by Hooper's impertinence, the Council summoned him before them. He appeared on January 13, 1551.[1] After a stiff reprimand, he was "committed to the Busshop of Canterbury's custodie, either there to be reformed or further to be punyshed as the obstinacie of his cace requireth."[2]

In the middle of January, Bullinger acted upon Burcher's suggestion. He wrote at least two letters to England: one to Hooper and one to the king. Of their contents, we know nothing; that they existed we learn from Burcher's comments upon them in his letter to Bullinger dated January 21.[3] A letter from Martyr to Bullinger dated January 28, gave the latest analysis of the situation.[4] Martyr insisted that wearing or failure to wear the vestments was not the issue as far as the bishops were concerned. They were angered at Hooper's contention that to wear them was ungodly and contrary to holy scripture. This the bishops would not permit to be taught to the people.[5] Regarding his own position Martyr assured Bullinger that it was his desire that the vestments be removed, but all could not be reformed in a moment. "There must be labour and time for this misshapen embryo to attain its proper symmetry and shape."[1]

---

[1] Acts of the Privy Council, III, p. 191.

[2] Ibid.

[3] OL, II, p. 676.

[4] Ibid., p. 486f.

[5] Ibid., p. 487.

For two weeks Hooper resided at Lambeth palace in the custody of Cranmer. Repeatedly the Archbishop sought to reason with him upon the matter. Others also tried their hand. Martyr later reported that he had at least three conferences with Hooper exerting "every effort to break down his determination."[2] He seemed to be making progress when "another person had access to him--the leader of the farce." (Probably à Lasco).[3] As a result of his advice, Hooper "was rendered far more obstinate, as I afterwards learnt, than ever before."[4] Martyr took his leave of Hooper after having warned him of the dangers which hung over him.

In late January it was obvious to Cranmer that Hooper would not compromise his position under any circumstances. He wrote a letter to the Council to that effect. Thereupon the Council on January 27, ordered Hooper committed to the Fleet and restricted from intercourse with anyone except "the ministres of that howse."[5] Surely Hooper was in desperate straits. Alone in his mission, he doubtless questioned whether he alone could be right and all others wrong.

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 488.

[2] Gorham, *op. cit*., p. 233.

[3] *Ibid*.

[4] *Ibid*.

[5] *Acts of the Privy Council*, III, p. 199f.

At any rate on February 15, the crisis was abruptly ended. Hooper wrote a letter of capitulation to Cranmer.[1] No doubt it was the most difficult of his life to write. He stated therein that he acknowledged "the liberty of the sons of God in all external things; which I do not affirm and believe to be either impious in themselves, or to be impious in any use of them: I reprehend, as Master Bucer and Master Martyr do, the abuse of them by those who use them superstitiously, or badly in other respects, ..."[2] Regarding his own scruples in the use of the vestments and the ordinal, he expressed his willingness to subject himself "to the judgment of your clemency, doing ex animo whatever you shall adjudge: . . . . For, in this matter I have begun so far to look with suspicion on my own judgment and opinion, that I have considered it more prudent and more becoming Christian humility, to stand and rely on the judgment of your clemency, or of those pious and learned men in the law of God whom you may nominate, than that of myself alone."[3] In conclusion he requested Cranmer to convey to the Council that his capitulation was not out of fear or dissimulation, but for the benefit of the Church.

The specific reason or reasons for Hooper's retraction are not known. Several possibilities, however, deserve mention. In the first place, it is most likely that Bullinger's letter written in mid-January reached Hooper in London by mid-February with some definite advice on the matter. That he advised Hooper to compromise on this issue is a distinct possibility. Certainly this was the advice he later gave to Elizabethan Puritans in their vestiarian struggles. Doubtless Bullinger was in complete sympathy with Hooper's goal, but he probably felt the issue at hand not of sufficient moment to sacrifice the whole mission. Hence he likely counseled Hooper to compromise on this issue. Sometime in this same period Calvin offered Hooper this same advice. In a letter to Bullinger, Calvin stated that he commended Hooper in his firmness "In refusing to be anointed, yet I should have preferred that he had not contended so far about the cap and surplice, (although I do not approve of them,) . . . ."[1]

---

[1] Gorham, op. cit., p. 233ff.

[2] Ibid., p. 233.

[3] Ibid.

In the second place, it is likely that Hooper was informed of the future plans of the Council for him if he persisted in his obstinacy. Foxe, in the Latin edition of his Acts and Monuments (1559), suggests that as a final measure "the bishops would have endeavoured to take away his life: For his servant told me [Foxe], the Duke of Suffolk sent word to Hooper, who was not ignorant of what they were doing."[2] Most likely this explains the comments made by

---

[1] Ibid., p. 242.

[2] John Foxe, Rerum in ecclesia gestarum . . . commentarii (Basel: 1559), p. 280, quoted in West, op. cit., p. 194.

Martyr and Calvin in the midst of the controversy. In a conversation with Hooper, Martyr informed him "of the dangers which hung over him."[1] Calvin also wrote of those who "oppose him treacherously."[2]

Possibly for these reasons Hooper succumbed to the will of the Church. That it was extremely difficult cannot be denied. A man of Hooper's temperament and conviction always suffers more deeply in defeat than others.

Meanwhile Bullinger, not knowing of Hooper's capitulation, sought to make his influence felt in other circles in England. On February 24, he penned a long letter to Cranmer wherein he urged the primate "to put an end to the controversy between the bishop of London and Hooper."[3] Sometime during that month he also wrote letters to Warwick, Cox, Hooper, à Lasco, and others.[4] Doubtless in some part they were concerned with the vestiarian controversy in England. Needless to say they arrived too late to influence the outcome of the controversy, but they are significant as showing Bullinger's concern for the matter and his determination to influence its outcome if possible.

On March 7, Hooper's appointment to the bishopric was confirmed by letters patent,[1] the consecration occurring "about the middle of Lent."[2] In that season, Hooper was commanded to preach before the king and the council in the robes of his office. Contemporary comments on this scene reflect the dual sentiments regarding the final outcome of the struggle. Hilles stated in a letter to Bullinger dated March 22: "Many of the [bystanders] either approving or condemning his dress, just as they were guided by their feelings."[3] At least one of that dissenting group was Micronius who wrote to Bullinger: "He was inaugurated in the usual manner, . . . yet not without the greatest regret both of myself and all good men, nor without affording a most grievous stumbling-block to many of our brethren."[4] Obviously Utenhovius believed Hooper had erred seriously. Compromise with evil is impossible. Believing Bullinger to share his disappointment and grief, he suggests that the Zurich Antistes might "write and advise him [Hooper]"--the implication being that Hooper needed a reprimand for his inconstancy. Hooper, in the meantime, vigorously pursued his duties in Gloucestershire.

---

[1] Gorham, op. cit., p. 233.

[2] Ibid., p. 242.

[3] OL, I, p. 23.

[4] Bullinger's Diarium, p. 38.

In perspective the vestiarian controversy was not simply the tragic result of a stubborn man, it was the struggle of a man committed to principles he believed to be God-given to lift English church life out of the compromised position into which it had fallen. It was an attempt to establish the English church soundly upon unwavering principles from the only source of unwavering truth--the Bible. In the final analysis it was an attempt to pattern the English Church upon the model of Zurich. Hooper failed in his immediate objective, but the English Church in Edward's reign could not know that he had sown seeds and won followers which would seek to teach Englishmen the same lesson again in years to come.

---

[1] Calender of the Patent Rolls, IV, p. 33.

[2] OL, II, p. 586.

[3] Ibid., I, p. 271.

[4] Ibid., II, p. 586.

6. Summary and Conclusion

In summary certain facts are outstanding. It cannot be denied that Bullinger intentionally sought by a variety of means to influence the changing structure of the English Church. Insisting on the sole authority of scripture, he wished the pattern of the primitive church to be the blueprint by which the Anglican reformers would reform their church. To that end letters and books were sent to England to proclaim the Tigurine gospel. Of equal importance were the numerous representatives of Tigurine thought at work in England--men who were theologically indebted to Bullinger personally or to the Tigurine tradition in general.

In this chapter it has been shown how stalwarts of the Tigurine viewpoint such as à Lasco, Martyr, Hooper, and ab Ulmis were well received into the most influential circles of English life. In church matters their opinions were not lightly received. Indeed they were held in such high esteem that they were awarded posts of responsibility in the English Church. Martyr was Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford. Hooper was the respected bishop of Gloucester and Worcester in spite of his earlier tiff with the Church over the vestments. Hooper, à Lasco, and Martyr were appointed by the crown to a commission for the revision of the canon law. Each of these three was also in demand as a consultant on ecclesiastical matters. Thus there can be no doubt that as persons, and more especially as theologians, they were honorably and respectfully received into the English Church. It naturally follows that their theological orientation was also well received and was not thrust upon the church as historians are inclined to insist.

In conclusion one must ask: What elements of the Edwardian reformation may be the result of Tigurine influence?

a) The Forty-two Articles

In 1553 the first official doctrinal statement of the Edwardian Church was published--the Forty-two Articles of Religion. Doubtless its late appearance was due to Cranmer's hesitancy to issue a doctrinal statement if his dream for a Protestant Consensus could materialize. Nevertheless, as early as 1550, while he dreamed, he set himself to the writing of some articles which he used unofficially in issuing licenses to preach.[1] Most likely these formed the basis of the Forty-two Articles published three years later. Certainly the Forty-two Articles received close scrutiny by many persons, among them several of the Tigurine party,[2] but they were basically the product of Cranmer's mind.

Regarding the purpose of the Articles, E. J. Bicknell insists that they were designed not as a systematic statement of theology, but as a general confession aimed at giving some sort of theological character to the church.[3] Their primary goal was to bring concord rather than to give an accurate theological definition. To be sure, the extremes--Romanism and sectarianism--were excluded, but the articles were sufficiently ambiguous as to embrace the broad stream of opinion in between. For our purposes it is sufficient to point out that theologically the Forty-two Articles were in complete harmony with Tigurine thought. Two of the Articles need special mention.

---

[1] OL, I, p. 76.

[2] E. J. Bicknell (A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1946) asserts that the Articles were probably submitted to the committee appointed to review the canon law (p. 17). If so, the following persons with Tigurine sympathies would have been consulted: Martyr, à Lasco, Hooper, Traheron, Skinner, and Cheke.

[3] Ibid., p. 16.

Article XVII, Of Predestination and Election,[1] in keeping with Tigurine thought, speaks only in terms of predestination or election unto eternal life. No reference is made to the fate of the reprobate. This was precisely the emphasis of Bullinger and the Tigurine party. Very likely that was its source.

Articles XXVI, XXVIII, and XXIX are concerned with the sacraments.[2] Article XXVI specifically rejects the Roman view, while Article XXIX precludes a Lutheran interpretation. With good Tigurine emphasis the physical body of Christ is declared to be in heaven and not accessible to man in the supper. The positive teaching of the Article stands unequivocally within the Reformed tradition. Certainly the wording of the XXVI article would seem to place it closer to the teachings of Calvin than to Bullinger. On the other hand, permitted interpretation, it is quite likely that the Tigurine party would not have found it offensive. Possibly this explains the reason why no individual in the Tigurine party raised any objection to the Article. It is important also to notice that when in 1550 in a letter to Bullinger Hooper made reference to these Articles, then circulating unofficially, he described the one relating to the eucharist as "plainly the true one, and that which you maintain in Switzerland."[1] In any case, if we accept as the purpose of the Articles to bring concord rather than precise theological definition, it is none short of amazing that they approached the Tigurine position as closely as they did. This would have been necessary only if there had been a strong and influential Tigurine party at work in England.

---

[1] Gilbert Burnet, The History of the Reformation of the Church of England (3 vols.; Dublin: A. Rhames, 1730-1733), Appendix, Part II, Book I, p. 166.

[2] Ibid., p. 168f.

b) The Books of Common Prayer--1549 and 1552

For generations historians have debated the problems relative to the sources and character of the Books of Common Prayer.[2] It is not within the scope of this paper to deal critically with most of these problems which ultimately have no satisfactory solution. (As frequently happens, the theological and liturgical bias of the historian predetermines his conclusions.) Nevertheless, Nathaniel Dimock, in an important study of the Prayer Books, reaches several conclusions of significance to this study.[1] He proposes the thesis that the authors of the Prayer Books had as their goal from the beginning a complete reformation of the liturgy to coincide with the Reformed theology which they believed in.[2] The end result, however, was dependent upon two important factors. First, the change had to be slow and gradual for fear of inciting a revolt among the populace. Martyr testified to this in a letter to Bullinger (June 1, 1550). He insisted that religion was making progress, but slowly. "Besides the worldly prudence of some parties who think it quite right that religion should be purified, but are willing only to make as few alterations as possible; for feeling as they do, and thinking as civilians, they consider that any great changes would be dangerous to the state."[3] In the second place, any alteration had to have proper legal sanction. That is, parliamentary approval was necessary for all innovations in worship. Thus it was that Cranmer was so gravely concerned at the insertion of the Black Rubric into the 1552 edition of the Prayer Book without parliamentary approval. In keeping with these two principles the First Book of Common Prayer came from the English presses with governmental approval in the spring of 1549. It was intentionally structured to permit a broad interpretation, especially a Tigurine interpretation. As the church was soon to learn, it was sufficiently broad to permit the old guard catholics to read the doctrine of Transubstantiation therein, while at the other extreme, though it permitted a Tigurine interpretation, it still harbored elements which would be offensive to a "dyed in the wool" Zuricher. Nevertheless, it was intentionally an interim proposal which looked to a further reformation in time.[1] To that effect Bucer wrote to Fagius (April 26, 1549):

---

[1] OL, I, p. 76. Of course, it must be admitted that possibly by 1552 the article was revised and thus the specific eucharistic emphasis expressed in the Forty-two Articles was not that that Hooper praised two years earlier.

[2] See: Nathaniel Dimock, The History of the Book of Common Prayer in its Bearing on Present Eucharistic Controversies (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1910); Gregory Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1945); Francis Proctor and Walter H. Frere, A New History of the Book of Common Prayer (London: Macmillan and Co., 1914).

---

[1] Dimock, *op. cit.*, Chaps. 1, 2. The author of this dissertation is supplying much of the evidence in support of the thesis from his own research.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

[3] *OL*, II, p. 482.

> We hear that some concessions have been made both to a respect for antiquity, and to the infirmity of the present age; such, for instance, as the vestments commonly used in the sacrament of the eucharist, and the use of candles: so also in regard to the commemoration of the dead, and the use of chrism; for we know not to what extent or in what sort it prevails. They affirm that there is no superstition in these things, and that they are only to be retained for a time, lest the people, not having yet learned Christ, should be deterred by too extensive innovations from embracing his religion, and that rather they may be won over.[2]

As we might suspect, to a Tigurine stalwart and one unfamiliar with the purpose of the book, such as Hooper, certain features of the Prayer Book were most offensive. We remember Hooper's irritation expressed in the letter to Bullinger (March 27, 1550):

---

[1] Dimock, op. cit., p. 14.

[2] OL, II, p. 536.

> It is no small hindrance to our exertions, that the form which our . . . parliament . . . has prescribed for the whole realm, is so defective and of doubtful construction, and in some respects manifestly impious . . . I am so much offended by that book, and that not without abundant reason, that if it be not corrected, I neither can no will communicate with the church in the administration of the supper.[1]

In April, 1552, the Second Book of Common Prayer was published. It approached the goal at which the reformers had previously aimed. Not only was Transubstantiation rejected, but also any language which might have suggested the Lutheran teaching.[2] Theologically, the new Prayer Book stood solidly within the Reformed tradition.[3] In order to vindicate this interpretation one need only examine the comments relative thereto made by the ardent Tigurine supporters. In September, 1553, when in prison, Hooper wrote to Bullinger lamenting the Roman reaction. Describing the situation he exclaimed; "The true worship of God, true invocation, the right use of the sacraments, are all done away with."[4] Surely Hooper could not have so expressed himself if he were dissatisfied with the new revision.

Martyr wrote an important letter to Bullinger (June 14, 1552) just two months after parliamentary approval of the

---

[1] Ibid., I, p. 79.

[2] Dimock, op. cit., p. 26.

[3] Ibid., p. 29.

[4] OL, I, p. 100.

Prayer Book.[1] He expressed pleasure that the new book was free of all that "which could nourish superstition."[2] He went further to state that all possibilities for Roman or Lutheran views were excluded. "Thanks be to God, concerning these things there seems to be no controversy as it regards those who profess the Gospel."[3] But even among those "who profess the Gospel," he indicates, there was not unanimity of opinion on the sacraments two months after official approval of the book. That is, among those of a Reformed theological persuasion, there was no complete agreement on the eucharist. The problem was: "Whether grace is conferred by virtue of the sacraments."[4] He states that there were "some" who affirmed this view, and wished it to be "established by public authority." On the other hand (and here Martyr clearly expressed his theological views) there were "others" who "clearly saw how many superstitions such a determination would bring with it."

> They made it a primary point to endeavour in all ways to show, that nothing more is to be granted to the Sacraments than to the external word of God, for by both these kinds of word is signified and shown to us the salvation obtained for us

---

[1] William Goode (ed.), An Unpublished Letter of Peter Martyr, Reg. Div. Prof. Oxford, to Henry Bullinger written from Oxford just after the completion of the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI (London: J. Hatchard and Son, 1850).

[2] Ibid., p. 5.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

> through Christ, which as many are made partakers of as believe these words and signs, not indeed by virtue of the words or of the Sacraments, but by the efficacy of faith . . . . Unless faith is present, they are always received unworthily, but if they who come to the Sacraments are endued with faith, they have already received through faith the grace which is proclaimed to us in the Sacraments, and then the reception and use of the Sacraments is the seal and obsignation of the promise already apprehended. And as the external words of God avail to the quickening and exciting our faith which is often torpid, . . . this same thing also the Sacraments can effect by the power of the Holy Spirit, and their use is of no little benefit to confirm our minds, otherwise weak, concerning the promises and the grace of God.[1]

In conclusion Martyr indicated that these were definitely his views when he wrote: "We were anxious that these things should be determined and established by authority concerning the Sacraments, that their use might at length be restored to a state of purity and simplicity."[2]

From these comments it is clear that the theology of the Second Book of Common Prayer stood within the Reformed tradition--but ambiguously so, siding neither freely with the Tigurine nor Calvinistic views of the eucharist. And two months after the official publication of the book, the controversy still existed. But for our purpose, it is sufficient to point out that the Tigurine party in England played a significant role in the formulation of the second Prayer Book.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 5f.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

c) The Puritan Legacy

The Elizabethan Church was witness to the rise of one of the most influential religious movements in the English Church: Puritanism. Traditionally historians have pointed to Geneva and Calvinism as the theological source of that movement. To be sure that was a powerful impetus through the sojourn of English exiles in Geneva from 1553-1558. But it is a fact which cannot be denied that the Tigurine party in Edwardian England was a powerful witness to those same theological principles at least a decade before the movement proper got underway in the sixteenth century. One need only point to Hooper who was as ardent and adamant a spokesman for biblical authority as any Puritan that ever lived. The strong insistence upon this same principle among the Marian exiles in Frankfort in July, 1554, is evidence enough of the success of Tigurine party efforts. Therefore since the Tigurine party identified itself with, and was influenced by, Bullinger and the Tigurine church, to some degree Zurich and Tigurine theology were the sources of the Puritan movement which had its feeble beginnings in the reign of Edward VI.

CHAPTER IV

THE THEOLOGICAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HEINRICH BULLINGER AND JOHN HOOPER

1. Introduction

By the year 1531 the Zwinglian theology, with its distinctive sacramental doctrine, commanded a large following in the growing Protestant community throughout Europe. Certainly Zurich and the surrounding cantons were closely instructed in the Zwinglian principles. We should not then be surprised to find that Zwingli's successor selected to carry on the tradition was in basic agreement with the Tigurine reformer's theology. Indeed the Anglican liturgical scholar, Gregory Dix, states unequivocally that, "all Zurich took him [Bullinger] for the very heir of Zwingli's mind . . . ."[1], while Reinhold Seeberg, the famed historian of dogma, adds the qualifying note: "Bullinger accepted his [Zwingli's] doctrinal views only in their general outline."[2] There is truth in both judgments. Bullinger was in agreement with Zwingli on all fundamental doctrines and therefore he must be regarded as a true Zwinglian. In less crucial doctrines he did diverge from his predecessor,[1] but one should not, therefore, conclude that he compromised the Zwinglian position. To do so is to conceive the Zwinglian teaching in much too rigid terms.

---

[1] Gregory Dix, "Dixit Cranmer et non Timuit - I" The Church Quarterly Review, CXLV (Oct.-Dec., 1947--Jan.-March, 1948), p. 157.

[2] Reinhold Seeberg, Text-book of the History of Doctrines (2 vols.; Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1954), II, p. 390.

The influences upon Bullinger's theology have already been stated, but need review here. As a student at Emmerich and Cologne, he was greatly impressed by the humanistic attack upon medieval scholasticism and learned well the principles of humanism. At this point his intellectual development paralleled that of Zwingli. From 1520-1527 his thought was tempered by the thought of Luther and of Melanchthon who forced him to seek an authority beyond the Church Fathers to the Word of God itself. Finally one must mention the most powerful influence of all--Ulrich Zwingli. The latter pulled together all of these intellectual threads and produced a reformation firmly grounded on theological principles. Bullinger was Zwingli's associate in much of the actual implementation of those principles in the Zurich ecclesiastical revision. All in all Bullinger stands as a fine example of the German-Swiss school of the Reformation.

As a theologian Bullinger was not original or creative. Nevertheless his treatises are clearly written, represent ample scholarship and rank with those of Calvin and Melanchthon in quality. The 150 treatises and manuscripts credited to Bullinger are the products of varied circumstances. Many are the result of controversy with Catholics, Lutherans, and Anabaptists. A larger portion comes from his experience as a pastor and took the form of biblical commentaries and published lectures on theological doctrines. Finally one must mention the influential confessional statements which were a product of his thinking. For this study two of his works are important and need consideration: The *Decades* and the *Second Helvetic Confession*.

---

[1] Compare Zwingli and Bullinger upon predestination, original sin, and church-state relations.

Bullinger's *Decades* have been called the Zurich counterpart to Calvin's *Institutes*.[1] Certainly in importance and influence this judgment is true, but in nature and purpose there is no comparison. The *Decades* are a series of fifty theological sermons divided into five groups of ten sermons each (hence the title). Each sermon (sometimes more than one) is a detailed exposition of some important doctrine of the Christian faith. In fact the detailed character of most of the sermons has brought the charge that they were never intended to be preached, but were designed for serious study.[2] It was never the intention of their author that they should be a comprehensive system of Christian thought, but simply a study in the chief doctrines of the Christian faith. Bullinger himself describes their character in these words: "Sie werden die Stelle von loci communes einnehmen."[1] Written in the period 1549-1551 when Bullinger was at the peak of his vitality, they represent his mature and reasoned judgment. We have already noticed their importance for the reformation under Edward VI. They were to achieve a status of even greater authority under Elizabeth I.

---

[1] Walter Hollweg, *Heinrich Bullingers Hausbuch* (Giessen: Münchowshe Universitatsdruckerei, 1956), p. 25.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 54. This is a difficult issue. Their length and the fact that they are not supported by biblical texts would seem to confirm this judgment. On the other hand, the following quotes from the *Decades* would indicate their

The second great monument to Bullinger's theological efforts is the Second Helvetic Confession. Bullinger wrote this symbol in 1562, when it appeared that he might die of the plague which was ravishing Europe. He intended that it should be deposited along with his will with the civil authorities upon his death, as a confession of his personal faith. In 1566 circumstances in Germany made it public and brought it to the attention of the entire Reformed Church. In time it was adopted as the confessional standard for the

---

sermonic character:

a) "But I suppose that there are few, or rather none at all here present, which do not perceive . . . ." Decades, I, p. 45.

b) "Being cut off with the shortness of time and detained by the excellency of the matter, I could not in my last sermon . . . ." Decades, I, p. 97.

c) "In this I have said (which is little indeed in respect of the largeness of the matter, but sufficiently long enough in respect of one hour's space appointed me to speak in), ..." Decades, I, p. 119.

[1] Staatarchiv, Zurich, E II 342, No. 210, quoted in Hollweg, op. cit., p. 24.

Reformed Church in all of Switzerland, the Palatinate, France, Hungary, Poland, and Scotland.[1] It was also well received in England and Holland. Bullinger wrote many other treatises of a theological nature, but none achieved the prominence of these two. For our study they shall be accepted as normative for his theology.

As we seek to discover the theological orientation of John Hooper, we shall find ourselves confronted by several problems. Like those of Bullinger, the writings of Hooper were the products of varied circumstances. Many were written in the heat of controversy and were therefore by nature polemical. Others, such as the Visitation Book, were the outgrowth of his episcopal duties. In only one treatise, A Godly Confession and Protestation of the Christian Faith, do we find him attempting to deal systematically with the major doctrines of the Christian faith. Frequently his writings do not contain carefully reasoned statements, but reveal thinking which is unclear, confused, and at times, totally illogical.

Only one of the treatises traditionally attributed to Hooper needs separate consideration here. A student of Hooper's writings will soon discover that the confession, A Brief and Clear Confession of the Christian Faith, stands in a class by itself. In style of writing and theology it is completely different from Hooper's other writings. In light of this W. M. S. West has conducted an extensive investigation into its authenticity.[1] The following discussion represents a summary of that research.

---

[1] Philip Schaff, The Creeds of Christendom (3 vols.; 6th ed.; New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, [1919]), I, p. 394.

The earliest extant edition of this confession was published as an appendix to a volume titled, Lectures of J.B. upon the xii Articles of our Christian Faith briefly set forth . . . also hereunto is annexed a brief and clear confession of the Christian Faith, containing an hundred articles, according to the order of the creed of the Apostles written by that learned and godly martyr J.H., some time Bishop of Gloucester, in his lifetime. (1581). It was separately published in 1584 as Hooper's work. Bishop Tanner in his list of Hooper's works given in his Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica gives the date of a previous edition as 1550, but there is no trace of such an edition. Until West questioned its authorship it had been accepted as a genuine work from Hooper's pen.

Certain factors militate against Hooper's authorship. (1) The edition of 1581 points to an earlier edition in general terms only: "written . . . in his lifetime." It would seem that if there had been a 1550 edition, the editor of the 1581 edition would have indicated the date of publication more accurately.

---

[1] West, op. cit., pp. 22-25.

(2) The Confession itself bears no signature of any kind, nor is it supported by a preface or dedication. This is most unlike Hooper's procedure. His writings are always supported by some sort of prefatory comments.

(3) The style of the Confession is completely unlike Hooper's other writings. It is clear, concise and carefully written. Hooper, on the other hand, had a cumbersome style. It was his tendency to set his pen to paper and then to let it move at will depending upon the concern which attracted his fancy at the moment. As a result digression follows digression supplemented by ambiguous phraseology. This is the first obvious distinction which must be made in comparing this Confession with Hooper's other writings.

(4) Assuming Bishop Tanner is correct in assigning 1550 as the date of the publication of this confession, it would seem rather strange that Hooper would write two confessions in the same year. In December of that year Hooper wrote his A Godly Confession and Protestation of the Christian Faith which reflects his difficult style and is by far the more inferior of the two confessions. This problem, in turn, leads us to two others of significance.

(5) There is no external evidence beyond that already mentioned to establish its publication in 1550 or at any other date in Hooper's life. This is most unusual for Hooper's other treatises play such an important role in his life that

they can easily be dated.

(6) If one compares the content of this confession with Hooper's other writings one finds it difficult to reconcile the obvious theological differences. This Confession is thoroughly Calvinistic. In its doctrine of the eucharist, for example, the elements are not mere sacramental signs but do in and of themselves give the grace of God which they offer. As we shall see later, Hooper rejected in his other writings any such notion. Similarly, this Confession establishes a clear doctrine of double predestination, whereas in his other writings Hooper admits only a doctrine of election and states that beyond that he will not creep into the secret counsels of God. In the third place the Confession speaks of the marks of the true Church as preaching of the Word, the correct administration of the sacraments, and discipline. In his other writings Hooper accepts the first two, but speaks nothing of the last mark. Other points of disagreement could be mentioned, but these will suffice.

(7) Finally, certain internal evidence would indicate that the Confession is of a later date, namely, references to Psychopannychia and texts from Scripture which would seem to come from the Genevan Bible.

West readily admits that no one of these points is sufficient unto itself to justify a scepticism of Hooperian authorship. But all taken together they represent a rather formidable body of evidence in the other direction. Therefore this Confession will not be considered in this chapter when dealing with Hooper's theology.

2. Bullinger and Hooper on Covenant Theology

Emanuel Graf von Korff, some fifty years ago, expressed the judgment that Heinrich Bullinger was the first covenant theologian.[1] He recognized that the theme of the covenantal relationship between God and man was to be found in Zwingli's writings,[2] but correctly concluded that at no time was it the fundamental doctrine (Ausgangspunkt) of his theology.[3] With Bullinger however, he saw this concept as the controlling principle of his theology, and for this reason, he concluded that Bullinger could legitimately be called a covenant theologian.[4] In more recent years, Peter Walser has taken issue with this thesis.[1] He maintains that, since Bullinger was a biblical theologian, his theology naturally reflects the non-systematic character of the Bible itself. This does not deny the importance of the covenant in his theology, however. He admits that the concept of the covenant is the means (Sammelpunkt) by which Bullinger displays his theology.[2]

---

[1] Emanuel Graf von Korff, Die Anfänge der Foederaltheologie und ihre erste Ausgestaltung in Zurich und Holland (Bonn: Emil Eisele, 1908), p. 15.

[2] Ibid., p. 11. To be sure, the idea will be found in Zwingli's De peccato originali declaratio ad urb rhegium, (1526); In catabaptistarum strophas elenchus, (1527); and Fidei ratio, (1530).

[3] Supporting this author in this judgment is Gottlieb Schrenk, Gottesreich und Bund in Alteren Protestantismus, ("Beiträge zur Förderung Christlicher Theologie"; Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1923), p. 37f.

[4] Von Korff writes: "Die Schrift ist für Bullingers Theologie nicht nur die alleinige Quelle, sondern ihr Inhalt ist auch der einzig Gegenstand derselben. Da er nun fand, dass die ganze geschichtliche Entwicklung des Reiches Gottes, wie sie im alten und neuen Testament vorliegt, in der Form von Bündnissen verlaufen ist, weil ihm ferner das Verhältnis des Menschen zu Gott als ein durchaus personliches und gegenseitiges, also als ein Bundesverhältnis erschien, so machte er dem Bundesbegriff zum bestimmenden Ausgangspunkt und zum beherrschenden Gedanken seines ganzen Lehrsystems," p. 16.

Therefore there is great question whether the term covenant theologian can appropriately be applied to Bullinger. Certainly it must be admitted that Bullinger was not a covenant theologian in the same sense that the term is customarily applied to men in the Puritan tradition of the seventeenth century. For example, at no point do we find him reasoning from the nature of the covenant to the nature of God as seventeenth century covenant theologians did.[3] In this sense we must agree that Bullinger was not a covenant theologian. On the other hand it must be affirmed that the Covenantal relationship figured prominently in Bullinger's thinking. For our purposes it shall be sufficient to discuss Bullinger's theology in terms of the Covenantal relationship. Insofar as it is possible to determine any fundamental structure to Hooper's theology, it is that of the covenantal relationship between God and man. However, nothing of certainty can be asserted. The ultimate test of any theological influence of Bullinger upon him must be reserved to the concluding section where an analysis of certain critical doctrines will be made.

---

[1] Peter Walser, Die Prädestination bei Heinrich Bullinger (Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1957), pp. 233-249.

[2] Ibid., p. 244.

[3] See Perry Miller, "The Marrow of Puritan Divinity," Errand into the Wilderness (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press, 1956), pp. 48-98.

In the beginning God created man in a state of righteousness.[1] That is, Adam was created "good, most pure, most holy, most just, and immortal, and adorned . . . with every excellent gift and faculty, so that there was nothing wanting to him in God, which was available to perfect felicity."[2] Thus Adam was created with a free will,[3] which enabled him to choose between good and evil. In order that he might exercise his freedom intelligently God gave him a law commanding him not to eat of the tree of knowledge.[4] Stated in the affirmative, the law required obedience and faith in God. Adam, through his free will, chose to eat of the fruit thus refusing obedience to God and showing lack of faith. Thus he incurred the just damnation of God. At this point Bullinger insisted that we must understand that Adam's fall was the result of his own free will and not the working out of an eternal decree.[1] He did not wish to give occasion for the charge that God is the author of sin and evil.[2]

---

[1] The Decades of Henry Bullinger ed. Thomas Harding, (4 vols.; "The Parker Society;" Cambridge: The University Press, 1849-1852), III, p. 362. Hereafter referred to as Decades; John Hooper, A Declaration of the Ten Holy Commandments of Almighty God . . . in Early Writings of John Hooper ed. Samuel Carr, ("The Parker Society"; Cambridge: The University Press, 1843), p. 258. Hereafter referred to as Dec. T.C.

[2] Decades, III, p. 368; John Hooper, A Godly Confession and Protestation of the Christian Faith . . . in Later Writings of Bishop Hooper ed. Charles Nevinson ("The Parker Society"; Cambridge: The University Press, 1852), p. 72. Hereafter referred to as Godly Conf.

[3] Decades, III, p. 369; Godly Conf., p. 72.

[4] Decades, III, p. 369.

God, however, was not willing that Adam should remain in disfavor, and so he devised the means by which the broken relationship could be mended and Adam could be brought once again into divine favor. God's answer was the covenant. Bullinger indicates that God chose this medium because it was a procedure already familiar to man.[3] Men, as individuals and as nations, in order to live safely and in peace with one another, bind themselves together in pacts, treaties, and covenants. By this procedure all parties concerned are able to know "what they be that make the confederacy, upon what conditions, and how far the covenant shall extend."[4] Because of the precise character of this arrangement, God chose it as the means by which he would heal the breech.[5]

Since God was the party wronged, it was he who offered the covenant and fixed the conditions. God, on his own behalf, offered to bestow his grace and favor upon man through the gift of his only Son, Jesus Christ.[1] It was "the living, eternal, and omnipotent God, . . . the chief maker, preserver, and god of all things"[2] who condescended to man, pledging, "I will be thy God, thy fulness and sufficiency."[3] Bullinger is quick to point out that God's condescension to man does not indicate any lack or need on God's part. On the contrary, God is "very fulness and sufficiency itself."[4] The nature of God's promise is the gift of his Son as satisfaction for the sin of man and as guarantor of God's grace and favor. Though Christ's coming was to be many centuries in the future, his coming at whatever time stands as a valid guarantee of God's favor beginning with the fall and lasting forever. Thus the terms of the Covenant are valid eternally.[5]

---

[1] Ibid.; Dec. T.C., p. 252f.

[2] Decades, III, p. 369; Dec. T.C., p. 264.

[3] Decades, II, p. 169.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid.

The other participant in the covenant was Adam--father of the human race through whose seed all men are infected with sin and by whose commitment to the covenant we are made heirs of the covenantal promises. Man's responsibility is to "walk before God and be upright."[6] In more precise terms, man must practice "faith and due obedience" unto God.[1] In later times God found it necessary to renew the covenant with Noah, Abraham, and Moses. With the latter the terms of the Covenant were spelled out in greater detail. "The conditions of the league [covenant] were at large written in the two tables [the tablets of Moses] and many ceremonies added thereunto."[2] Thus we see an embellishment of the original requirements laid upon Adam. However, Bullinger insists that "in the substantial and chiefest points, ye can find nothing altered or changed"[3] from the original covenant. Thus from the time of Moses onward, it was obedience to God's will as found in the law which is specifically the commitment of man in the covenantal relationship. But the terms of the covenant are binding from the Fall to the present, obligating all generations in the past, present, and future. Thus there is only one covenant binding men of both the Old Testament and the New Testament. The terms and obligations for both are identical. At this point there is a significant difference between Bullinger and seventeenth century Puritan thinkers.[4]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 170; Dec. T.C., p. 255.

[2] Decades, II, p. 170.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., p. 171.

[5] Ibid., p. 170.

[6] Ibid., p. 171; Dec. T.C., p. 255f.

Since obedience to the law is obligatory for Jew and Christian, Bullinger wrote extensively of its proper interpretation. In the first place, he insists that the faithful, from Adam until the time of Christ, knew that the observance of the bare letter of the law was impossible, indeed it was designed to drive man to despair.[1] But this was and is not its sole purpose. It is also an instrument of revelation. Finding ourselves unable to fulfill the will of God through our own strength, the law "leads us directly by faith to Christ."[2] This it does by preaching "the true doctrine of justification, teaching plainly that we are justified by faith in Christ, and not by the merits of our own works."[3] All of this, Bullinger insists, the faithful people of the Old Testament understood, and therefore they "did not seek for righteousness and salvation in the works of the law, but in him which is the perfectness and end of the law, even Christ Jesus."[4]

---

[1] Decades, II, p. 169.

[2] Ibid.; Dec. T.C., p. 255.

[3] Decades, II, p. 170.

[4] See Miller op. cit.

In a similar way the "ancient saints," that is, the faithful, the elect of God (not all men) were able to discern through the eyes of faith the "prefigurement" of Christ in the law and in all the ceremonies.[5] They understood, for example, that the numerous ceremonies, which expressed Jewish worship, were not to be understood literally and that the ceremonies in and of themselves were not pleasing to God. Instead, these ceremonies had the function of directing the minds and faith of God's people "upon the Messiah to come who was prefigured in all the ceremonies and ordinances of the law."[1] It must be admitted that there were many who failed to understand the "true" meaning of the law and the ceremonies. Certainly there were those who "did abuse the law, who thought that they were acceptable to God, and that they served him as they should because they were busy in those ceremonial works."[2] Thus these men lived under external shadows and outward figures.[3]

---

[1] Decades, II, p. 240; Dec. T.C., p. 282.

[2] Decades, II, p. 240.

[3] Ibid., p. 241.

[4] Ibid., p. 242.

[5] Ibid.

The two most important of the ceremonies instituted by God were circumcision and the feast of the passover. Bullinger describes these as "signs or seals" designed to confirm the covenant between God and man.[4] Circumcision had the added importance of being "a testimony and a seal of free justification in Christ, who circumciseth us spiritually without hands by the working of the Holy Ghost."[5] It is most important to notice that in Abraham's case, and therefore for all mankind, the outward act of circumcision was not that which saved him.[1] To the contrary, circumcision was a sign that God had justified man through grace "before his circumcision."[2] Thus the act itself was an outward confirmation of God's inner activity; man's justification is not thereby ultimately dependent upon the act itself.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 243.

[4] Ibid., p. 172; John Hooper, A Declaration of Christ and his Office in Early Writings of John Hooper. ed. Samuel Carr ("The Parker Society"; Cambridge: The University Press, 1843), p. 76. Hereafter referred to as Dec. C.O.

[5] Decades, II, p. 175.

Bullinger understood the Passover to be the second sign or seal which God selected for confirming the covenant between God and man. To the faithful participant in the ceremony, it had a past dimension: "to keep in memory the benefit which God did for them in the land of Egypt."[3] In this sense the observance of the Passover "did, after a sort, make a sermon to their eyes and other senses."[4] To that same participant there was a present dimension: A testimony of God's good will toward all that remain faithful and a means whereby the faithful are gathered together into the fellowship of one body and are reminded to be thankful and righteous.[5] And finally there was a future dimension to the

---

[1] Ibid.; Dec. C.O., p. 76.

[2] Decades, II, p. 175; Dec. C.O., p. 76.

[3] Decades, II, p. 179; John Hooper, An Answer unto my lord of Winchester's Book . . . in Early Writings of John Hooper, p. 126. Hereafter referred to as Ans. B.W.

[4] Decades, II, p. 182.

[5] Ibid., p. 179.

Passover: A witness to "what Christ should be, what he should do for the world, by what means the faithful should be partakers with him, and how . . . [the faithful] should behave before him."[1]

In the fulness of time the Son of God became incarnate as God's chosen means of securing the promise to Adam in the Covenant and of rendering satisfaction to his offended justice. The validity of the Covenant depended upon one with sufficient power and authority to guarantee it. Natural man could not do this. Hence an incarnation was necessary. Christ therefore stands as the promised Messiah and guarantor of the Covenant.[2] He has legitimate claim to these titles because he was able to appease the offended justice of God through his sacrificial death upon a cross. Thereby God's promise of communion and fellowship with those who believe was made possible. It was then incumbent upon man to accept this fellowship through repentance and faith.

The community of the faithful, since the death of Christ, is known by the term "Church." But the Church is in no way different from the community before the incarnation.[3] Both terms are designations of the same community. The community of God's faithful exists from the beginning until the end of the world.[1] Like the synagogue, the Church militant, i.e. the Church as an institution in society, is composed of those who are truly faithful to Christ--"lively members, knit unto Christ, not with bands and other outward marks and signs, but in spirit and faith"[2]--and those who "believe not truly or unfeignedly."[3] But it is only those who are truly faithful that are the elect of Christ and thus are justified. While the exact constituency of this group is known to God alone,[4] any man can know that he is a member of it, if he has faith. By faith, which is trust in God's promises, man receives the imputation of Christ's righteousness unto him and thus becomes a Son of God.[5] Man receives faith not because of any effort on his own but through the unmerited action of the Holy Spirit.[6] Thus man is no longer bound to obey the law in its absolute demands, but to have faith in Christ who is the fulfillment of the law.

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 183.

[2] _Ibid_., III, p. 19; _Dec. T.C_., p. 257.

[3] _Decades_, IV, p. 4; _Ans. B.W_., p. 127.

Following the atonement, the Church was given two new signs or seals of God's promise fulfilled in the Covenant: baptism and the Lord's Supper. These symbols function for the post-resurrection Church just as circumcision and the feast of the passover did for the Church before Christ: to recall to man's mind God's gracious act toward him in Christ and to admonish him of his duty of faith and obedience.[1] Thus the goal of the Sacraments is that of a witness, a testimonial, a sign and seal. Man's ultimate salvation is not bound up in them. However, the Christian man will make use of them because they have been commanded by Christ. Apart from these ceremonial activities, the Christian Church is freed from the ceremonial obligations of the Jews.

---

[1] Decades, IV, p. 10; Ans. B.W., p. 127.

[2] Decades, IV, p. 7; John Hooper, Visitation Book in Later Writings of Bishop Hooper, p. 121. Hereafter referred to as Visit. Book.

[3] Decades, IV, p. 8; Visit. Book, p. 121.

[4] Decades, IV, p. 7.

[5] Decades, II, p. 250; Dec. C.O., p. 51.

[6] Decades, II, p. 251; Dec. C.O., p. 51.

3. Bullinger and Hooper on Christian Authority

Christian authority was the fundamental theological problem of the sixteenth century. The Roman church claimed the authority of both scripture and tradition. Indeed the Council of Trent (1545-1563) decreed in its fourth session that both were to be received "with an equal affection of piety and reverence."[2] The Protestant Reformers broke with Rome on this crucial issue and held the Holy Scriptures to be the sole authority of God's revelation.[3] Tradition, they asserted, is the product of man's corrupt mind, and, therefore, can have no value in Christian life and practice.

---

[1] Decades, IV, p. 234; Ans. B.W., p. 126f.

[2] H. J. Schroeder, Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent (London: B. Herder Book Co., 1955), p. 17.

[3] Rupert E. Davies, The Problem of Authority in the Continental Reformers (London: The Epworth Press, 1946).

Bullinger and Hooper were true to the Protestant tradition in the matter of Christian authority. Bullinger introduced the four volumes of his Decades with an essay on the Word of God. The only Christian authority is the Word of God at first "uttered in a lively-expressed voice by the mouth of Christ, the prophets and the Apostles; and after that again registered in writings which are rightly called holy and divine scriptures."[1] Since the writers of the canonical scriptures are no longer living to enlighten us by word of mouth, we must reverence the Bible as God's truth set forth in writing. Similarly Hooper wrote, "God hath preserved in all captivities and persecution of the church miraculously one book, the holy Bible; delivered the same unto the Church, and bound the Church unto this book, ... They only be the Church, that embrace this holy book, the bible, heareth it, learneth it, and followeth the judgment of it."[2]

The Bible as the Word of God is unique. It is the sole criterion for Christian life and practice.[3] Thus the Apostolic tradition so important in Roman Catholic authority must stand at the bar of scripture for judgment. Bullinger wrote, "Confer the things, which these fellows set to sale under the colour of the apostles traditions, taught by word of mouth and not by writing, with the manifest writings of the Apostles; and if in any place you shall perceive those traditions to disagree with the scriptures, then gather by and by, that it is the forged invention of men, ..."[1] Likewise must the teachings of the Church fathers be accepted only insofar as they conform to the biblical faith. Bullinger and Hooper, like all of the Reformers, were steeped in the teachings of the fathers and held them in high regard. They were diligently read and frequently quoted in all of their writings. But there was never any hesitation to condemn some part of their teaching when it was believed to be unscriptural. Notice the rule which Hooper and Bullinger established: (Hooper)--"If any error be in their [fathers] writings, we may leave it by the Authority of scripture, and offend nothing at all. They wrote, not to be judges of the scripture, but to be judged by the scripture."[2] (Bullinger)--"We believe not the fathers further than they can prove their own sayings by the canonical scriptures; neither would they have themselves otherwise believed."[3] Finally, authority was attributed to creeds insofar as they conformed to this same criterion. Both men believed the creeds of the early church to be "in such wise taken out of the word of God."[4] Thus the

---

[1] Decades, I, p. 37.

[2] Ans. B.W., p. 138f.

[3] Decades, I, p. 61f.; Dec. C.O., p. 30.

---

[1] Decades, I, p. 64.

[2] Ans. B.W., p. 170.

[3] Decades, IV, p. 431.

[4] Visit. Book, p. 120; Decades, I, p. 13.

Bible was posited as the sole basis for deciding matters relative to Christian life, thought, and practice.

It would naturally follow that the Bible as God's Word is infallible. Hooper expressed Bullinger's sentiments when he wrote, "No contrariety may be admitted in the scripture; for if one place be false, there is none true, which were a blasphemy to say."[1] But in the writings of neither man does one find a "dictation theory" of the scriptures as can be found in Calvin's writings.[2]

Not only is the Bible infallible, but it is also a complete and sufficient revelation for Christian man. Bullinger speaks of the Bible as containing "the whole effect of godliness, and what things soever are available to the leading of our lives rightly, well and holily. For, verily, it must needs be, that that doctrine is full, and in all points perfect, to which nothing ought either to be added or else to be taken away."[3] Certainly this was fundamental to Hooper's thinking also,[4] and the basis upon which he sought to reform the Church of England. His attack upon the vestments symbolizes the concern of this man to actualize this principle in church life.

---

[1] Ans. B.W., p. 113; Decades, IV, p. 431.

[2] John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, trans. Henry Beveridge (London: James Clarke and Co., Limited, 1953), IV, 8, vi.

[3] Decades, I, p. 61.

[4] Ans. B.W., p. 111.

Hooper states that the Bible was written "to lead us unto God, and unto repentance of ill."[1] Thus it contains all things necessary unto salvation. In the second place, it was written "to teach us God and all goodness."[2] Thus it contains all things necessary for living the Christian life. Finally, it was written "to be judge of all men's doctrine, and to save those that Christ redeemed with his precious blood from all heresies and false opinions."[3] Thus theological disputes must be settled by the Bible.

Neither Bullinger nor Hooper conceived of biblical interpretation as being easy and uncomplicated. On the contrary, to discern God's truth in the scriptures, it is necessary to meet certain conditions previous to opening the Bible. In the first place, God's truth is not discernible to all who open the Bible and read. It is God's Word to his people only. Those who come to it curiously "to search out the hidden counsels of God, or desire to be counted skilful and expert in many matters" will miss its true message and fail to discern God's will."[4] It must be read "with great reverence," "with continual prayers" and "earnest requests." That is to say, only those who read the word of God with faith and possess the working of the Holy Spirit in their hearts will know its truth.[1] But even this is no guarantee that the individual will not err in interpretation. Indeed, the "spirit-filled" man remains man and may err out of finitude. The more the individual surrenders his will to God and receives increase in faith, the more accurate he becomes in discerning God's truth revealed in the Scriptures. In order that the one single proper interpretation of God's will be discernable, God set aside certain persons with "the gift and knowledge to open the scripture."[2] It is, therefore, the function of pastors and teachers to guide their charges into the correct understanding of God's truth. Under no circumstances must it be believed that the gift for "opening the scriptures" is bound to a "succession of bishops, or title of dignity."[3] Indeed, in the strict sense of the word, neither Hooper or Bullinger believed that any man interpreted scripture. "The Word of God only . . . interpreteth itself."[4] Therefore it is the function of the Christian teacher or pastor simply to serve as a channel through which God reveals his truth.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 169.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Decades, I, p. 64; Dec. T.C., p. 84f.

---

[1] Decades, I, p. 66.

[2] Dec. C.O., p. 82; Decades, I, p. 70f.

[3] Dec. C.O., p. 82.

[4] Dec. T.C., p. 344.

Bullinger and Hooper were well aware that there is "some darkness in the scriptures," i.e. passages which are difficult of interpretation due to idiomatic expression, symbolism and difficult language translations. But these, Bullinger insists, can be overcome by "study, diligence, faith and the means of skilful interpreters."[1] In his treatise De scripturae sanctae authoritate, certitude, firmitate, et absoluta perfectione (1538) and in the first volume of the Decades (1549), Bullinger sets forth in scholarly fashion the principles of interpretation which must be applied to scripture. Hooper on the other hand in no place deals systematically with the subject. One must discern his principles as he actually seeks to elucidate difficult texts in the course of his writing.

According to Bullinger a proper study of the Bible must include the following principles of exegesis:

1. First, it must be recognized that "some things in the scriptures . . . are so plainly set forth, that they have no need of interpretation."[2] He cautions the minister not to be so foolish as to try to make them plainer. However, at no place does Bullinger attempt to set forth a standard by which these "clear" tests can be distinguished. Obviously he believed there would be no debate on the matter.

---

[1] Decades, I, p. 71.

[2] Ibid., p. 75.

2. The exegesis must "agree fitly" with "the received Articles of our faith, contained in the Apostles Creed and other Confessions of the ancient fathers."[1] For example, when we read in John's Gospel that the Lord said, "The Father is greater than I," "We must think, that it is against the articles of our faith to make or admit any inequality in the Godhead betwixt the Father and the Son; and therefore, that the Lord's meaning was otherwise than the very words at the first blush do seem to import."[2] Certainly this contradicts his previous assertion for we earlier saw that creeds were to be judged by the Bible.

3. In the third point Bullinger insists that no exegesis of Scripture is correct which does not reveal chairty toward God and man's neighbour.[3]

4. The interpreter of Scripture should "mark upon what occasion everything is spoken, what goeth before, what followeth after, at what season, in what order, and of what person anything is spoken."[4]

5. Difficult passages should be handled "by conferring together the places which are like or unlike, and by expounding the darker by the more evident, and the fewer by the more

---

[1] Ibid., p. 75f.

[2] Ibid., p. 76.

[3] Ibid., p. 77.

[4] Ibid., p. 78.

in number."[1] Hooper is in hearty agreement with Bullinger on this principle.[2] It is interesting that both use the text "This is my body" as an example of a text that must be understood by the collation of other scriptural texts.

6. Bullinger concludes that the most effective principle of all for biblical exegesis is to approach the Word of God with a heart that loves God and his glory.[3]

4. The Sacramental Theology of Bullinger and Hooper

Theological controversy in the sixteenth century centered around the doctrine of the Eucharist. Distinctive sacramental foci were found in Rome, Wittenberg, Zurich, and Geneva. It was not uncommon that a person was considered a theological friend or foe depending upon his allegiance to one of these "schools" of thought.

The sacramental agreement between Bullinger and Calvin (Consensus Tigurinus, 1549) has traditionally been interpreted as the mark of unity between Zurich and Geneva on this difficult issue. Indeed there does not seem to have been any sacramental controversy between them for many generations thenceforth. Because of the obvious Calvinistic emphasis which permeates this document, historians of dogma have pointed to it as evidence that Bullinger forsook the Zwinglian fold in sacramental theology for the mediating position of Calvin.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ans. B.W., p. 160ff.

[3] Decades, I, p. 79.

The fact is that the Consensus Tigurinus was a unity on paper only. Contrary to majority opinion, Bullinger never abandoned the Zwinglian fold in his sacramental theology. Two years after the Consensus Tigurinus Bullinger published the fifth and last of his Decades, of which over 250 pages are dedicated to a minute study of the sacraments. His views here are firmly within the Zwinglian tradition and shall be the basis of the following study of Bullinger's sacramental doctrine. Dix makes the interesting comment that Calvin "was never again willing to use the language which he used at this time [in the Consensus Tigurinus]."[1] Thus it would seem that Calvin, too, compromised more in the wording of this statement than his true theological position would permit him to go. Therefore it is the working hypothesis of this study that throughout the sixteenth century there remained in Switzerland two sacramental doctrines.

a) Bullinger's Sacramental Doctrine

In Bullinger's thought the Christian sacraments (Baptism and the Lord's Supper) serve the same function as did circumcision and the passover in the Old Testament.[2]

---

[1] Gregory Dix, "Dixit Cranmer et non Timuit--I," The Church Quarterly Review, CXLV (Oct. - Dec. 1947), p. 148.

[2] Decades, IV, p. 298.

They are signs or symbols instituted of God, signifying the legality of the covenantal relationship between man and God.[1] As such it is their function constantly to recall to man's mind God's gracious act toward him in Christ, and to admonish him of his duty of faith and obedience. Bullinger insists that this was precisely the function of circumcision and the passover for the Jews. The sole difference between the two sets of symbols is to be found in their outward physical expression. The sacraments of the Old Testament foreshadowed the coming of Christ and his redemptive work;[2] whereas those of the New Testament reveal that Christ has come and has accomplished that which was promised. Thus the difference is purely one of mode and historical viewpoint. In essence these sacraments are identical. Both testify to Christ as Redeemer who works in his church that men may obtain salvation through faith which conditions originate in the covenant.[3] Thus the goal of the sacraments is that of a witness, a testimonial, a sign and seal.

Bullinger consistently maintained that man is saved by faith in Christ. Faith is a spiritual condition of the human soul, brought about through the gift of the Holy Spirit. As such its reception is not tied to any physical material elements. Bullinger insists that man, as a partaker of the sacramental elements, cannot through the elements as vehicles, receive the gift of faith. He insists that the reception of the sacraments among Christians is "also counted among our works."[1] Therefore if grace were conferred by the sacraments, man's salvation would be based on human merit--the very thing he opposed in Romanism.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 234.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 297.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 298.

Bullinger's sacramental doctrine necessitates the belief that man's faith is the _a priori_ to receiving the sacraments, for to receive them without faith is to commit blasphemy and to incur the damnation of God.[2] And truly he asserts this in unambiguous terms: "The holy and elect people of God are not then first of all partakers of the first grace of God and heavenly gifts, when they receive the sacraments; for they enjoy the things before they be partakers of the signs."[3] With reference to the Old Testament he shows that Abraham was justified before his circumcision and that it was the function of circumcision to seal and confirm to him God's righteousness previously revealed through faith.[4] Once again we see the unity of the Old and New Testament faiths in his thought, for he deduces from the Old Testament reference that, "we, who are the sons of Abraham, are after no other manner justified than it appeareth that our father was justified; and that our sacraments work no further in us than they did in him, especially since the nature of the sacraments of the people of the Old Testament and ours is all one."[1]

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 305.

[2] _Ibid_., p. 469.

[3] _Ibid_., p. 311.

[4] _Ibid_.

But then are the sacraments to Bullinger and the whole Zwinglian tradition barren and empty as many of his contemporaries asserted? He answers unequivocally: yes, if you mean that "the things themselves [the substance of Christ's body] [are] included in them [the signs]."[2] On the other hand, if you mean that the elements, i.e., bread, wine, water, are in no way different from the same elements in another context, then he repudiates the charge and insists that they are "not naked; and therefore full, not void or empty."[3] This is so because God himself has set them aside, consecrated them to a holy use: as a witness to God's gracious act in Christ.[4]

But is there not some sense in which Christ is present in the administration of the sacraments? Or does the Christian in partaking of the sacraments experience no more than a man who turns his mind back in contemplation of a book read last week? That is to say, are the sacraments merely signs, stimulators of the mind which "keeps something in memory among men."[1] Bullinger denies the latter and insists that there is a sense in which man does have communion with Christ in the sacraments. But this communion must be understood in the broader context of what it means to have faith. Man has communion with God through faith which is a gift of the Holy Spirit. This Bullinger calls the _spiritual eating_ of the body and blood of the Lord by the faithful. Spiritual eating must be equated with having faith and believing.[2] Thus there is no essential relationship between spiritual eating and physical elements of bread and wine. This communion or spiritual eating is a day by day relationship which man experiences as he reads his Bible, as he talks with another Christian, as he hears a sermon, or as he partakes of the sacraments. The quality of the communion in each case is the same.[3] When this eating takes place in the context of the Lord's Supper, Bullinger calls it sacramental eating.[4] But the essential nature of the eating is the same as the "eating" in any other context. Certainly in the sacramental eating there is no sense in which the communicant, when receiving the elements, automatically receives a spiritual transfusion. He does admit that sacramental action has the additional advantage over other expressions of spiritual eating by "exciting" man's faith through the holy drama before his eyes. But this is a psychological effect and not basically a religious one.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., p. 313.

[3] Ibid., p. 314.

[4] Ibid.

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 229.

[2] _Ibid_., III, p. 31.

[3] _Ibid_., IV, p. 452.

[4] _Ibid_., p. 463.

1. Baptism. Bullinger defines baptism as: "An holy action instituted of God, and consisting of the word of God and the holy rite or ceremony whereby the people of God are dipped in the water in the name of the Lord . . . whereby the Lord himself doth represent and seal unto us our purifying or cleansing, gathereth us into one body, and putteth the baptized in mind of their duty."[1] It is the minister who performs the rite and utters the testimony of the remission of sins, but it is God himself who has previously regenerated the individual through his Spirit by giving him faith.[2] Thus the ritualistic act is an outward manifestation of the inward action of the Holy Spirit. The ritualistic act itself has no justifying value.[3] It is God through the "Holy Ghost working in the soul . . . [that] changeth, purifieth, and quickeneth."[4] There is no necessary causal relationship between the ritual-

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 352.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 367.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 375.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 379.

istic act of baptism and the actual baptism of the soul by God through the work of the Holy Spirit. Thus when Bullinger writes: "For we willingly grant that baptism is necessary to salvation, as well in such as are of perfect age as also in babes or infants; . . . ."[1] He means that the mysterious mystical work of the Holy Spirit in the soul of the individual is necessary for salvation. This is the real baptism which must not be confused with the ritualistic act by that name.

Bullinger readily admits that there are some who receive the outward sign, that is, have received the sign of baptism, but who have not received the true baptism by God through the Holy Ghost. These persons are not of the elect, and thus are not of God's people. No man has a right to speculate as to the constituency of this group. Any man that confesses that God is God and that Jesus Christ is Savior must be accepted into the visible fellowship of the faithful and given baptism.[2]

True to the Zwinglian tradition Bullinger held to the necessity of infant baptism. Just as the Jewish infant became a member of the covenant through circumcision,[3] so the Christian infant becomes a member of that same covenant through baptism. The act in both cases is identical, the mode alone is different.[1] Both acts introduce the child into the community of God's people which is the same from Adam to the present. Thus Bullinger justifies infant baptism on the ground that the act is identical to Jewish circumcision.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., p. 382.

[3] Ibid., p. 383.

In keeping with all that has been said Bullinger is most concerned that man not make more of the ritualistic act of baptism than God intended. He vigorously opposed the Catholic and Lutheran sacramental doctrines on precisely this point.

2. The Lord's Supper. Bullinger defines the Lord's supper as "an holy action instituted unto the church from God, wherein the Lord, by the setting of bread and wine before us at the banquet, doth certify unto us his promise and communion, and sheweth unto us his gifts, and layeth them before our senses; gathereth them together into one body visibly, and, to be short, will have his death kept of the faithful in remembrance; and admonisheth us of our duty, and especially of praise and thanksgiving."[2]

Stress must be given to the fact that in the Supper, the communicants do not receive some special grace not obtainable in other Christian action, but instead receive a renewal of the promise made by God in the covenant.[3] God's gracious action in the life of the communicant is the a priori to a proper participation in the Lord's Supper. As previously shown,[1] Bullinger does not deny a "spiritual eating" of the body and blood of Christ in the context of the Lord's supper. He does deny that that eating is in some way unique or special. Hence he is firmly memorialistic in his doctrine of the Lord's supper. Thus he spent much time and effort in seeking to correct those of the Roman Catholic and Lutheran viewpoints. He sincerely felt that they made a serious error in attributing more to the Lord's Supper than God intended.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 373.

[2] Ibid., p. 403.

[3] Ibid., p. 434.

b) Hooper's Sacramental Doctrine

Hooper's sacramental doctrine, like Bullinger's, must be understood in the context of the covenantal relationship. He insists that the children of God before the time of Christ, and those since his crucifixion and resurrection, are one people and retain the same sacraments.[2] Though in outward mode they are different; "the sacraments of the Old Testament and the New in effect be one; and give a right censure and judgment of the one, and then are we instructed aright in both."[3] The sacraments are instituted by God for many reasons but chiefly as "testimonies of God's pleasure toward us . . . ."[1] They serve to remind man of God's promises to him in the covenant and serve to guarantee that those promises are valid and in effect.[2]

---

[1] See p. 188.

[2] Ans. B.W., p. 126.

[3] Ibid.

The Christian is responsible for the proper interpretation of the sacraments. He must not make of them less than they are, nor must he attribute to them more than they are.[3] Hooper is especially concerned that the latter error be avoided--an error to which he felt Catholics and Lutherans had succumbed.

Indeed Hooper was most diligent in his attack upon the sacramental views of these groups. He attacks them on their insistence that in some way Christ must be eaten corporally.[4] His objections are two-fold. First, this position is unbiblical. Christ possessed two natures: one human and the other divine.[5] Since his resurrection Christ has been with us in his divine nature only, i.e. spiritually; Christ's human nature, i.e. the body, remains in heaven at the right hand of God.[6] Thus to maintain that Christ's body is on earth in sacramental elements is to deny the explicit Biblical statement that it is at God's right hand. Secondly, such a doctrine is contrary to the sense experience of man.[1] Hence such expressions as neque cum pane, neque in pane, neque sub pane, neque per panem, neque ante panem, and neque post panem are mere words affirming a proposition which man's senses tell him is false. "His body is not a fantastical body nor invisible, as these teach that say his corporal body is corporally given in the bread, with the bread, and under the bread."[2] "God calleth man to the judgment of his senses, and saith, "Reason what they will of my body, and say it is here or there substantially, bodily, corporally, believe them not: trust to thine eye, ..."[3]

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 199.

[2] _Ibid_., p. 196.

[3] _Ibid_.

[4] _Ibid_., p. 191.

[5] _Dec. C.O_., p. 63.

[6] _Ibid_., p. 65ff.

From this last quotation it is also obvious that Hooper would have no sympathy for the eucharistic views of John Calvin. Like Hooper and others of the Tigurine tradition, Calvin repudiated any doctrine of the supper which claimed that the communicant, when receiving the bread and wine, feeds corporally upon the body and blood of Christ. Instead he taught that when the individual in faith partakes of the bread and wine, he spiritually feeds upon the substance of the body and blood of Christ.[4] Hooper would not tolerate such language. In his thinking there was no distinction between a corporal eating of Christ's body and a substantial eating.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 63.

[2] Ibid., p. 62.

[3] Ibid., p. 63.

[4] Institutes, IV, xvii, 12.

Instead Hooper stood with Zurich in his insistence that the sacramental signs, i.e. water, bread, and wine, do not in and of themselves convey the body and blood of Christ to the communicant.[2] It is their function merely to attest to God's secret working through the Holy Ghost in the soul of man which working is the a priori to a proper receiving of the sacraments. He makes this unquestionably clear in his comments on baptism: "Although baptism be a sacrament to be received and honourably used of all men, yet it sanctifieth no man. And such as attribute the remission of sin unto the external sign, doth offend."[3] "Such as be baptized must remember, that penance and faith preceded this external sign, and in Christ the purgation was inwardly obtained, before the external sign was given."[4] Thus there is an "inner baptism" which is the really justifying act: an act which is the work of the Holy Spirit and is, therefore, completely spiritual and divorced from material elements. Man receives this inner baptism when he is empowered with faith, which is to believe and trust that Christ is the only Author of salvation.[5]

Hooper expresses this same divorce between the inner working of the Holy Spirit and the sacramental signs in his eucharistic doctrine. "As for the sacramental eating, where as Christ's institution is truly observed, there is nothing but a memory of this death, ..."[1] By such a statement Hooper does not mean to imply that individuals partaking of the Lord's Supper do not in any way have fellowship with Christ in that act. Such a claim would mean that Christ was absent from the Christian community. On the contrary, Hooper believed that in the context of the Lord's Supper the individual does have fellowship with Christ in faith.[2] But this fellowship is in no way a unique fellowship which could not be experienced in some other context. In true Tigurine terms Hooper speaks of this fellowship as a "spiritual eating" by the faithful upon Christ. "True it is, that the body is eaten, and the blood drunken, but not corporally. In faith and spirit it is eaten, and by that sacrament the promise of God sealed and confirmed in us, ..."[3] "And thus to be partaker of the worthiness and deservings of Christ's passion, is to eat the body and to drink the blood: therefore doth Christ in the vi. of John take "eat" for "believe," and "believe" for "eat," so many times. And St. Augustine saith, . . . "Why preparest thou the teeth and belly? Believe and thou hast eaten." And whosoever eateth after this sort the body of Christ, and drink his blood, hath everlasting life."[1] Thus the sacraments become different manifestations of the same divine act: Baptism is the initial gift of faith which brings one into the community of God's people; the Lord's Supper is a renewal of that faith through fellowship with Christ. Simply because God does not use the sacramental signs as vehicles of his grace is no reason to abandon them. Indeed such would rightly incur the wrath of God and imply that they are "bare signs" and tokens.[2] A faithful man will receive the sacraments because he is anxious to obey the will of God's commandment.[3] On the other hand, to receive the sacramental signs without faith is to commit blasphemy. "They that without repentance receiveth this sacrament aggravate and double their sin, because with condign honour and reverence [they] contemptously receive the body of Christ."[4]

---

[1] Dec. C. O., p. 63; Ibid., pp. 68-69.

[2] Ibid., p. 63.

[3] Dec. C. O., p. 74.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 156.

[2] "But when the minister delivereth unto me the thing that is in his power to deliver, to say, the bread and wine, rehearsing the words of Christ's institution, the Holy Ghost delivereth unto my faith, which is mounted and ascended into heaven, the precious body and blood of my Saviour Jesus Christ spiritually . . . . [The body of Christ] may be in heaven, and yet extend his virtue by the operation of the Holy Ghost unto my soul, by the means of faith, which at the time of the receiving of this sacrament is in my soul . . . ." Ans. B. W., p. 191. This quotation has led some to believe that Hooper held to a Calvinistic view of Christ's presence in the supper.

[3] Ibid., p. 191.

Finally one must consider the validity of infant baptism. Hooper affirms the practice on the basis of the biblical statement: "I will be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee." (Gen. xvii. 7.) - God's word in the context of the covenantal promise.[1] Thus to the children of God's faithful does the promise pertain; and to the promise must be added the sign.[2] If a child dies before the rite of baptism is performed salvation is his through the mercy of Christ. Hence there is no justification for baptism by women.[3]

---

[1] *Sermons on Jonas*, p. 530.

[2] *Ibid*.

[3] *Dec. C.O.*, p. 74f.

[4] *Ans. B.W.*, p. 179.

5. Bullinger and Hooper on the Eucharistic Liturgy

We have seen that both Bullinger and Hooper maintained an exclusive biblical authority for Christian life and practice. We must now see the implications of such an authority for sacramental worship, i.e., a service of the Lord's supper. We shall set forth their views in the following parallel columns.

Bullinger	Hooper
Source of eucharistic worship	
"This is the most simple and best manner of the Lord's supper, *which the Apostles received of Christ delivered to be observed of all nations*."[4] (Italics mine)	"But the words of Matthew and Mark shall admonish the Christian reader, what ceremony ought to be used in the church before the use of the sacraments, what the minister should do, and what the rest of the people should do."[5]

Thus the Bible as God's written word supplies the Christian community with the necessary elements for divine worship.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 132.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 133.

[4] *Decades*, IV, p. 407.

[5] *Ans. B.W.*, p. 177.

Elements of the Service in proper order[1]

1. Preach most diligently to the congregation of the mystery of Christ's passion and of man's redemption.	1. "Preach the death of Christ unto the Church, and the redemption of man, as Christ did at his supper."
2. "Groanings and vows of prayers of the faithful."	2. "to have common prayers, as Christ prayed with is disciples."
3. Rehearsal of the holy mysteries.	3. "to repeat the last words of the supper."
4. The people receive the holy mysteries and communicate together.	4. "to break the bread and distribute the wine to the whole church."
5. "the faithful make an end with this holy mystery with giving of thanks."	5. "Giving thanks to God."
6. dismissed	6. "depart in peace."

From this comparison one can see that the two men were in absolute agreement as to the source of Christian worship and the pattern which eucharistic worship must follow. A service of worship must never be the product of man's endeavors, but must emulate the divine pattern given in the New Testament. Only then can it be *simple*, *pure*, and *perfect*--the three adjectives which recur repeatedly in Bullinger's writing when he seeks to evaluate divine worship and its earthly counterpart. For example, in the *Decades* he writes:

"For to what end serveth the most *simple*, most plain, best and *perfectest* form of the supper, delivered of the Lord himself and received of his apostles, if we devise another? . . . ."[2]

---

[1] *Decades*, IV, p. 406f., 408f., *Dec. C.O.*, p. 61.

[2] *Decades*, IV, p. 407.

"We, which defend and hold that the institution of our Lord Christ which is delivered unto us by the apostles is most pure and perfect, do nothing regard neither what any man, nor at what time any bishop both added this or that holy rite, or else hath taken away or changed; but rather what he, who is before and above all, did first himself, and commanded to be done."[1]

"The high bishop of the Catholic Church, Christ our Lord, celebrated his supper with his diciples in like sort, as we have now seen and heard, without all pomp, simply, plainly and sparingly."[2]

After rehearsing the manner of Christ administering the Last Supper, he concludes, "This is the most simple and best manner of the Lord's supper, which the apostles receiving of Christ delivered to be observed of all nations."[3]

"But Paul, the vessel of election, knowing Christ's institution to be most perfect, and that the same ought to be kept still in the Church simply and without any addition, saith to the Corinthians: . . . ."[4]

"Certainly it is well known, how that certain hundred years after the death of the Apostles this simple manner of celebrating the Lord's supper was held in the church."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 409.

[2] Ibid., p. 406.

[3] Ibid., p. 407.

[4] Ibid., p. 408.

It is significant also that when Hooper had occasion to refer to the eucharistic worship in Zurich, he spoke of it in these terms: "As it is most simple among you, so it is most pure."[2] (Italics mine). At other times he wrote: "The apostles and primitive church did celebrate the Lord's most holy supper without pomp and all this rabble of stinking ceremonies, most simply. My lord [bishop of Winchester] should not be offended with those that would the supper to be used simply."[3]

"And so I doubt not, most gracious king, but your highness will, according to your title and style, purge this Church of England to the purity and sincerity of God's word."[4] Thus he adopted the same terms of reference as that expressed by Bullinger. Throughout his writings his emphasis is the same: the New Testament pattern of eucharistic worship is that which the Church must follow because it alone is "most perfect, holy, and religious." Thus those writers who insist that Elizabethan Puritanism with its insistence upon purity in worship is solely a product of Calvinistic influence in the reign of Elizabeth should remember that John Hooper in Edwardian England sounded a clear call for reformation on this same principle. Precisely what Hooper's influence was upon the later Puritan movement is unknown, but to him must go some credit for introducing the tradition to English soil.

---

[1] *Ibid*.

[2] *OL*, I, p. 56.

[3] *Ans. B.W*., p. 237.

[4] John Hooper, *An Oversight and Deliberation upon the Holy Prophet Jonas*, in *Early Writings of John Hooper*, p. 542. Hereafter referred to as *Sermons upon Jonas*.

The biblical principle of scriptural warranty, when stated negatively, means that those elements in, or accessories to, worship which are non-biblical must be repudiated. Indeed, Bullinger chastised those who strayed from the biblical path at this point: "Wherefore when this question is asked, whether it be lawful to sup after another rite or manner; whether it be lawful to add or diminish anything from the manner left and delivered, or to change anything therein; . . . there is no small folly and rashness, yea, rather great ungodliness, therein bewrayed."[1] The following comparison of the views of Hooper and Bullinger on critical elements of non-biblical liturgical practice reveals their unanimity also.

	Bullinger	Hooper
1. Is communion in both elements necessary?[2]		
A.	Both are necessary	Lord's Supper is "a communion unto all men under both kinds."
2. Where should services be held?[3]		
A.	"If tyrannical power will	In churches, if possible, but

---

[1] Decades, IV, p. 407.

[2] Ibid., p. 414; Ans. B.W., p. 139.

[3] Decades, IV, p. 418; Ans. B.W., p. 173.

not allow us to have a Church, what shall let us but that we may reverently celebrate the supper in honest private houses."	if "church is corrupted and sacraments used contrary unto the institution of Christ: there every man may in his private chamber, with his Christian and faithful brothers, communicate according to the order of the Scripture . . . ."

3. Should altars or tables be used?[1]

A. "A removing table agreeth better with the example of Christ."	"Erect and set up the Lord's board after the form of an honest table, decently covered, . . . and take down and abolish all the altars."

4. What type of apparel should the minister wear?[2]

A. "It is not disagreeable from the first institution, if the minister come unto the Lord's table covered with his own garment, so that it be comely and honest." Eucharistic vestments are rejected.	"I would wish the magistrate to remove them vestments." He was happy to wear common street clothes.

5. What language to be used in worship.[3]

A. The common language of the people.	"It is not lawful for any man to sing or say in the church in any kind of tongue other than such as the people shall be able to understand."

6. How should the supper be received?[4]

A. "It is most agreeable with the first simplicity and institution of the supper, to sit."	"Sitting in my mind, were best, for many considerations."

---

[1] Decades, IV, p. 418; Visit. Book, p. 128.

[2] Decades, IV, p. 420; Sermons upon Jonas, p. 541.

[3] Decades, IV, p. 421f.; Visit. Book, p. 123.

[4] Decades, IV, p. 422; Sermons upon Jonas, p. 536.

7. Is private communion permissible?[1]

A. Positively not.	"Alone no man may receive it, though his faith be never so good, and the minister never so godly."

From this study we have seen that in matters of theology there is an amazing similarity between Hooper and Bullinger. But it is not thereby possible simply to conclude that Hooper was influenced by Bullinger. One must remember that reformation ideas and principles were circulating throughout Europe in this period. Doubtless any man interested in reform encountered many of the same ideas from many sources. All one has to do is to examine the great variety of books which were coming from the presses of Europe to see how similar the views and arguments were. Thus in all fairness one must admit the possibility that Hooper could have obtained his ideas from a source or sources other than Zurich and Bullinger. We must, therefore, seek some external evidence which can justify the conclusion that in theology Hooper was a student of Bullinger and the Tigurine tradition.

It must be stated at the outset that there is no statement in existence made by Hooper wherein he affirms a doctrinal indebtedness to Bullinger. Just short of this, however, is a significant comment made by Hooper in a letter to Bullinger. On December 27, 1549, Hooper wrote regarding his reforming efforts in England: "If I am able to effect anything, and my slender powers are of any benefit to the church of Christ, I confess, and by the blessing of God will confess, as long as I live, that I owe it to yourself and my masters and brethren at Zurich."[1] Here Hooper seems to be saying that his whole understanding of the Christian faith--its theology and the implementation of that theology in Christian life and practice--has been learned in Zurich. Certainly as one reads the correspondence between these two men and studies the principles of reformation which guided Hooper's work, one can readily affirm that this is true.

---

[1] Decades, IV, p. 428; Ans. B.W., p. 170.

Apart from this one direct statement, the letters of Hooper contain a variety of other testimonies of significance. One finds numerable references of an indirect sort which reveal that Hooper affirms the theological position of Bullinger. For example, in Hooper's very first letter to Bullinger (January 27, 1546) before the two men had ever met, Hooper indicates that he has been captivated by the writings of Bullinger. He wrote:

> Not many years since, . . . there most happily and auspiciously came under my notice certain writings of master Huldrich Zwinglius, . . . and also some commentaries upon the epistles of St. Paul, which your reverence had published for the general benefit, and which will prove a lasting monument of your renown.
>
> These singular gifts of God exhibited by you to the world at large, I was unwilling to neglect, especially as I perceived them seriously to affect the eternal salvation and happiness of my soul;

---

[1] OL, I, p. 73.

> so that I thought it well worth my while, night and day, with earnest study, and an almost superstitious diligence, to devote my entire attention to your writings. Nor was my labor in this respect ever wearisome to me . . . .[1]

Shortly after this first communication, Hooper wrote again to Bullinger desiring the latter's "judgment and opinion,"[2] on a certain problem. Hooper promises that when he has Bullinger's advice he will follow it "without any deceit or dissimulation." Thus even before the two men had met, Hooper attributed a rare degree of authority and respect to the opinions of Bullinger.

Upon his return to England, Hooper carried on an extensive correspondence with Bullinger. Hooper's letters carry through with this same emphasis indicated above. In the first place, Hooper is tireless in his requests that Bullinger supply him with books and manuscripts from the latter's pen. From April 8, 1549, until his death in 1555 his letters abound in pleas for these writings. On October 27, 1551, Hooper wrote: "Of all the learned men under heaven, I have none more dear to me than yourself, and deservedly so. In many ways I have received benefit, as I still do, from you and from your writings . . . . I return you my warmest thanks for your kindness in sending to me, . . . your godly and learned meditations, ... I much wish for your other writings, and will amply recompense the copyist."[1] As we have seen, Bullinger was not negligent in supplying Hooper's request.

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 33.

[2] _Ibid_., p. 38.

In the second place, it is significant that whenever Hooper was in a crisis or was shouldered with some great responsibility, he immediately called upon Bullinger for his opinions and support. For example, in May, 1549, the month of his return to England, a controversy raged around him concerning the liberty of a woman to divorce her husband on grounds of adultery.[2] In his book, A Declaration of the Ten Holy Commandments of Almighty God, Hooper affirmed the liberty of a woman to seek divorce on these grounds. Vigorous opposition was soon expressed, and Hooper found himself at the center of a controversy. Thereupon, he wrote to Bullinger on May 31,[3] requesting the latter's opinion on the matter. "In your next letter, as you love me, either confirm my opinion, or correct my error."[4]

As a second example, one need only refer to Hooper's invitation in the spring of 1550 to preach weekly during Lent before the young monarch and the Council of regents.[5]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 96.

[2] Ibid., p. 64.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid., p. 75.

Naturally Hooper was greatly pleased with this opportunity. That was his chance to speak the word which might result in a reformation of the Church of England on biblical principles. That was a chance he could not bungle. Thus he wrote to Bullinger in a great sense of urgency: "Do you, my reverend friend, write back as soon as possible, and diligently instruct me as to what you think may conveniently be said in so crowded an auditory. It must necessarily be great when before the king; . . . ."[1] From these examples it is clear that Hooper greatly respected the theological position of Bullinger.

Another set of references in the letters of Hooper need consideration. Hooper repeatedly made statements which would indicate that he regarded the Zurich church, both in theology and Christian practice, as the model which other churches would do well to emulate. On March 27, 1550, he wrote: "With the exception of the Church of Zurich, and those which agree with it in religion, the word is in no part of the world preached more purely than in England."[2] More particularly, on the critical doctrine of the Lord's Supper, Hooper indicates that the Zurich Church is enlightened. His letters of the latter months of 1549 and the early months of 1550 indicate that this issue is crucial as he seeks to discern friends and foes in the Church of England. He states that he has "freely conversed" with many leading churchmen on the issue and found them to "entertain right opinions in the matter of the eucharist."[1] The "right opinion" he later indicates is "that which you maintain in Switzerland."[2]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., p. 84.

This attitude is also directed toward the structure of worship, particularly eucharistic worship, in Zurich. In a recommendation of Jan Utenhovius to Bullinger, Hooper states that he is sending him to "hear your godly sermons and theological lectures, and observe the mode of administering the Lord's Supper, which as it is most simple among you, so is it most pure."[3]

From the evidence thus presented there can be no doubt but that Hooper held Bullinger and the Tigurine Church in the very highest regard both in matters of theology and church practice. That Hooper was also influenced by this tradition with Bullinger as its chief spokesman is also clear from his own statements. This, coupled with the fact that in matters of theology there is a fundamental agreement between Hooper and Bullinger, gives a firm ground for concluding that Hooper was a disciple in theology of Bullinger and the Tigurine tradition.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 76.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 56.

CHAPTER V

THE ZURICH EXILES

By the spring of 1553 it became evident to the inner circle of the government that the young king was seriously ill and not likely to survive many months. Fearing the accession of a Catholic queen, Warwick maneuvered effectively to place Lady Jane Grey on the throne in the case of Edward's death. On July 6 the king was dead, and Jane Grey was proclaimed the new sovereign. For approximately two weeks she reigned uncertainly only to have the nation rally to the legitimate heir. By July 25 Mary was Queen of all England.

Devout Catholic that she was, it was only a matter of time before Mary would reinstate Romanism as the established religion. Thereupon, those responsible for heresy would suffer the fortune bequeathed to heretics by the Roman tradition in the sixteenth century. Believing imprisonment and even death to be the prospect, the reformers set about to plan their future. Several of them, especially those in high ecclesiastical positions, determined to remain diligent shepherds to their flocks, and fearless witnesses to their faith in face of the inevitable. Such were Cranmer, Hooper, Ridley, and Latimer. Others, according to the thesis of Miss

Garrett,[1] set about to protect and to mature the embryonic Protestant movement which they had developed to benefit Englishmen in years to come. To that end, Englishmen of reformation sympathies, especially theological students, from the universities were secretly organized into communities and hurried off to the continent in late 1553 before the repressive measures of the Marian government were even enacted. Chief among the reasons for the exodus was: "The education abroad, in an atmosphere unpolluted by idolatry, of a body of students of divinity who, it was intended, should one day become the clergy of a reformed Anglican Communion."[2]

The sites in Europe selected for the settlement of the exiles were not chosen haphazardly. It was the policy to select those cities--Strassburg, Frankfort, Emden, and Wesel--which, in the weeks previous, had given refuge to one or other of the stranger congregations which has left England upon Mary's accession.[3] The one exception to this rule--Zurich--is of significance. The fact that Zurich was the sole exception and that it received one of the first exile groups lends credence to the fact that it held a place of importance in the minds and hearts of English reformers.

---

[1] Christina H. Garrett, The Marian Exiles (Cambridge: The University Press, 1938).

[2] Ibid., p. 8; OL, II, p. 514.

[3] Garrett, op. cit., p. 46.

Bullinger recorded in his diary on March 10, 1554, that Thomas Lever and another named "Hugone" (Hugo) arrived in Zurich on that day.[1] Miss Garrett postulates that Lever was on a mission to make arrangements for the group of English students due to arrive several days later.[2] Indeed, Bullinger's diary informs us that thirteen Englishmen did arrive on April 5.[3] Apart from a possible settlement in Emden earlier than that date, the Tigurine exiles were the first to settle down to await their return to England.

The constituency of the Tigurine settlement is most important. Unlike the other refugee settlements which comprehended men of varying socio-economic classes, that in Zurich was composed exclusively of men of letters from the two great English universities. When it is remembered that one of the possible reasons for the exile was the education abroad of men for the future reformed church of England, then it was not by coincidence that Zurich was selected as the site for educating some of the most promising young minds in England. The implication is clear: they were specifically sent to be trained in Tigurine theology and principles of church reform. It is significant also that they did not form themselves into an English colony such as happened in the other refugee centers wherein they could have conducted their own worship, controlled their own discipline, etc. Instead they participated fully in Tigurine life, passing their time as students in the prophezei and worshipping regularly in the Grossmünster. Arrangements were made for the largest number of them to live together. At least ten of them were housed in collegio in a house owned by Froschover.[1] There they were cared for by the widow of an evangelical minister. Others were housed in private homes in the town.

---

[1] Bullinger's Diarium, p. 46.

[2] Garrett, op. cit., p. 9.

[3] Bullinger's Diarium, p. 46.

A short census of those first refugees in Zurich is important for a proper appreciation of their role in later English ecclesiastical affairs.[2]

Richard Chambers:[3] After an exhaustive search, Miss Garrett concludes that Chambers still remains an enigma. It is her opinion that he was the continental liason man responsible primarily for distribution of funds to the exiles. Prior to his association with the exiles and after his return to England, little is known of him. The length of his sojourn in Zurich is unknown. As keeper of the purse, he constantly traveled among the refugee centers. It is most unlikely that he should be regarded as a student. Coming to Zurich with the first contingent of students, it was probably only his responsibility to get them settled.

---

[1] Ibid. "Habitabunt velut in collegio zu der hinderen Linden, hinder der Truw und vorderen Linden, in des Froschowers huss."

[2] Bullinger states in his Diarium that ten English students arrived on April 5, but he then proceeds to list thirteen. No satisfactory explanation can be given for the discrepancy (p. 46.).

[3] Garrett, op. cit., pp. 111-114.

Robert Horne:[1] Before he arrived in Zurich, he had been a fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge (1536), where he received a B.D. in 1546. In 1550 he was appointed rector of All Hallows, Bread Street, and chaplain to Edward VI. The year following he was made dean of Durham. In the fall of 1553 he was summoned before the privy council, but instead of complying, he fled the country probably in the company of à Lasco's strangers' congregations. He joined the main body of students traveling toward Zurich in Strassburg in the spring of 1554. He remained in Zurich for one year until he was summoned by Cox to Frankfort to aid in the settlement of the liturgical controversy. Here he remained until the summer of 1557 serving both as reader of Hebrew in the university established by the exiles there and as pastor of the English congregation. The last few months before Mary's death, he spent in Strassburg. Upon his return to England in the early days of 1559, he was restored to the deanery of Durham. In 1561 he was elevated to the see of Durham.

Thomas Lever:[2] He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he took his B.D. in 1552. From 1551-1553 he was Master of his college. Very early he had identified himself with the extreme Protestant party at court. He fled to the continent on Mary's accession taking with him students from Oxford and Cambridge. It would appear that he was leader of the party destined for Zurich. The length of Lever's stay in Zurich is confusing and uncertain. His name appears on two documents there, when at almost the same time letters are written by him from distant cities. His sojourn in Zurich could not have been for many months. Later he became embroiled in the troubles in Frankfort, siding against Knox and with Cox. In the spring of 1557, he led the Wesel congregation in its move from that city to Aarau, where he settled down as pastor to this group of English refugees until the accession of Elizabeth. Upon his return to England he became unpopular with the English authorities because of his opposition to the Settlement. Nevertheless he was made rector of Coventry in 1559 and later became Master of Sherburne Hospital (1563).

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 188-190.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 219-221.

James Pilkington:[1] He was a fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, (1539) from which he received his B.D. in 1551. He arrived in Zurich with the original party in April, 1554. There he remained until the spring of 1556. From there he journeyed to Geneva (two months sojourn), into the Cevennes, to Basle, and finally, to Frankfort. Even before his return to England in February, 1560, he was appointed to Sir Thomas

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 250-251.

Smith's committee for Prayer Book revision. In March, 1561, he was consecrated bishop of Durham.

Michael Reniger:[1] He was a student at Cambridge and a "demy" of Magdalen College, Oxford, where he held a fellowship from 1546-1553. He sojourned in Zurich from April to November, 1554. In the latter month he was in Strassburg but seems to have returned to Zurich in 1555. In 1561 he was appointed chaplain to Queen Elizabeth.

John Mullins:[2] He was a fellow of Magdalen College in 1541 and received his M.A. degree from there in 1545. He lived in Zurich with the original party of exiles until sometime in 1555, when he accepted an invitation to become reader in Greek in the newly organized English university at Frankfort. It is generally believed that he was anti-Puritan, and that his sermon at Paul's Cross in October, 1573, provoked one of the exiles, probably Whittingham, to write the famous account of the troubles at Frankfort. He received no important appointment upon his return to England after the accession of Elizabeth.

Thomas Spenser:[3] He was a "demy" of Magdalen College in 1540; M.A. of Christ Church in 1547, and proctor in 1552-1553. He studied in Zurich from April, 1554, to November,

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 269-270.

[2] Ibid., pp. 234-235.

[3] Ibid., p. 292.

1556, when he became a member of Knox's congregation at Geneva. From that time forward he was an ardent Puritan. Upon his return to England, he became archdeacon of Chichester and rector of Hadleigh in Suffolk.

Henry Cockcroft:[1] In 1547 Cockcroft became a fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, received his M.A. in 1549, and in 1551 was ordained deacon at York by the bishop of Hull. Spending only seven months in Zurich, he journeyed to Frankfort where he studied away his time until the death of Mary. Nothing is known of him in Elizabeth's reign.

Thomas Bentham:[2] In 1546 he was a fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and in 1552 Dean of Arts. He remained in Zurich until the fall of 1554 when he traveled to Basle where he matriculated in the English school established there. After a year as a student and preacher to the English exiles, he moved to Frankfort and eventually to Geneva where he probably collaborated with other scholars on the Genevan Bible. He returned to England before the end of Mary's reign to preach to the hidden congregation in London. On March 24, 1560, he was appointed bishop of Coventry and Lichfield.

Robert Beaumont:[3] He received his M.A. degree from Peterhouse, Cambridge, in 1550. As far as can be ascertained, he lived in Zurich from April, 1554, until November, 1556. During the latter month, he joined Knox's congregation in Geneva and became a resident of the city. With Elizabeth's accession he became Master of Trinity College, Cambridge (1561) and eventually Vice-Chancellor of the University (1564-1565). He is remembered as an ardent spokesman for Elizabethan Puritanism.

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 121.

[2] *Ibid*., pp. 86-87.

[3] *Ibid*., p. 83.

Laurence Humphrey:[1] He was a student at Magdalen College, Oxford, in 1546, and a fellow from 1548-1556. He left England sometime after October 31, 1553, arriving in Zurich with the student party in April, 1554. Most likely he remained there until the fall of 1555, when he enrolled as a student at the University of Basel. Here he lived rather permanently except for a brief sojourn in Geneva. On his return to England he became Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge (1560) and later president of Magdalen. He was an ardent Puritan.

William Cole:[2] He was educated at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, of which he was made a Fellow in 1545. He resided in Zurich from April, 1554, until probably the summer or fall of 1556. Taking his leave of Zurich, he visited Frankfort, Basel and seems to have settled down in Geneva in the summer of 1557. Under Elizabeth he became president of

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 193-194.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 123.

Corpus Christi College (1568). In 1596 he became Dean of Lincoln.

Nicholas Carvell:[1] In 1553 he received an M.A. degree from King's College, Cambridge. Arriving in Zurich in April, 1554, he resided there until sometime in 1555 when he took up residence at Frankfort. Nothing of certainty has been ascertained of his status under Elizabeth.

The signatories to a letter dated October 13, 1554, and written by the English exiles in Zurich,[2] include the names of two Englishmen who were not members of the original party which arrived in April. They were John Parkhurst and Roger Kelke.

John Parkhurst:[3] Parkhurst was a fellow of Merton College (1529), and later a tutor there. In 1547 he was a chaplain to Queen Catherine Parr. Under Hooper he received an appointment to Cleeve which gave him a close association with the bishop. Most likely at Hooper's insistence, Parkhurst journeyed directly to Zurich when he left England. Arriving sometime before the middle of October, 1554, he took up residence for the next four years in the home of Rudolph Gualter, where the two men renewed a friendship made in 1537 when Gualter visited Oxford in the company of Nicholas Partridge. Upon the accession of Elizabeth, he received appointment to the see of Norwich from which he antagonized the crown with his puritanical sympathies.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 110.

[2] William Whittingham (?), A Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfort 1554-1558 A D, (ed.) Edward Arber (London: [Privately printed], 1907), p. 31.

[3] Garrett, op. cit., pp. 244-245.

Roger Kelke:[1] In 1545 Kelke was made a fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. Two years later he received the M.A. degree. It is proposed that he left for the continent in the company of the students led by Lever, but his presence is not recorded in Zurich until October 13, 1554. In the winter of 1555-1556, he went to Basel where he enrolled in the University. He was a rigid nonconformist and as Master of Magdalen College, Cambridge (1565), he sought to interfere with the Queen's proclamation for enjoining habits. He was twice chosen vice-chancellor of the university.

The foreign refugees in England were among the first to leave the land upon the accession of Mary. Among them was Peter Martyr. By late October, 1553, Martyr had withdrawn from England and was settled in Strassburg again after a six year absence. However, because of his eucharistic views, he expressed doubt to Bullinger as to whether he could permanently settle there.[2] He wrote to Bullinger asking him to recommend him for any teaching post that might come to his attention. In the spring of 1556 the learned Hebraist, Conrad Pellican of Zurich, died. Martyr was an obvious choice for the vacant post, and thus an invitation was issued. After some negotiations, Martyr was able to secure his release from Strassburg. He joined the Zurich faculty in July, 1556.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 202-203.

[2] OL, pp. 505-507.

While a teacher at Oxford, Martyr had established close friendships with several English students, notably John Jewel. Upon the accession of Mary, Jewel retired from England and took up residence in Frankfort with the English exiles. It would appear that he was not well received, since just before leaving Oxford he had "byn at masse, and also subscribed to blasphemous Articles." Thus he welcomed Martyr's invitation to join him in Strassburg. When Martyr moved to Zurich in 1556, Jewel and another English student, Edwin Sandys, took leave of Strassburg and joined their mentor in Switzerland. Thus it was that two more Englishmen joined the group of English students diligent in their studies at Zurich.

John Jewel:[1] Jewel was a fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, from 1542-1543, and a pupil and friend of John Parkhurst. Around 1551 he was appointed archdeacon of Chichester and also rector of Sunningwell, Berks. In April, 1554, he acted as notary to Cranmer and Ridley in their disputation at Oxford. Probably around January, 1555, he fled England and took up residence at Strassburg. He arrived in Zurich with Martyr in the summer of 1556 and remained there until December, 1558, except possibly for a brief trip to Italy. In Zurich Jewel lived upon the most intimate terms with Martyr and formed an extremely close friendship with Bullinger and other Tigurine divines. Upon his return to England he was appointed bishop of Salisbury and was recognized as one of the outstanding theologians of the Anglican Church.

---

[1] Garrett, op. cit., pp. 198-199.

Edwin Sandys:[1] Sandys studied at St. John's College, Cambridge, and was vice-chancellor of the university at the death of Edward VI. An ardent supporter of Jane Grey's claim to the throne, Sandys was arrested and imprisoned by Mary. Sometime in the spring of 1554, he was released and immediately made his way to the continent. He seems to have settled in Strassburg until the summer of 1556 when he journeyed to Zurich in the company of Peter Martyr. There he lived until the accession of Elizabeth. In the new reign he received several posts of responsibility, among them being the archbishopric of York (1577).

Finally mention must be made of three Englishmen--John Pretio, Edward Frensham, and Thomas Sampson--who visited Zurich at some period during the exile. The first two are something of an enigma to historians. Very little of certainty is known of them at any period of their lives, and only by incidental reference do we know of their presence in Zurich. It is unlikely that they were important in the Elizabethan Church. Sampson, on the other hand, was destined to play an important role in Elizabethan England as a leader of the Puritan faction. In a letter to Beza (1567), Bullinger gave his estimate of him: "He is . . . of an exceedingly restless disposition. While he resided amongst us at Zurich, and after he returned to England, he never ceased to be troublesome to master Peter Martyr of blessed memory . . . . The man is never satisfied; he always has some doubt or other to busy himself with."[1] In later years he frequently wrote to Bullinger for advice in ecclesiastical matters (thus indicating the respect accorded to Bullinger's views), but consistently rejected his advice as being too conservative and inconsistent with the biblical faith. Surely the Tigurine viewpoint had influence with him, but ultimately the views of Calvin had sway.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 283-284.

We have now completed a summary of all those Englishmen _whom we know_ sojourned for a period in Zurich. Certainly it will be admitted that in number they were few, especially when one considers that approximately eight hundred Englishmen went into exile. But surely these were a _select few_. As we shall see in the succeeding chapter, a majority of them held posts of great responsibility in the Elizabethan church. No less than seven future bishops, an archbishop of York, and two professors of divinity were domiciled in Zurich at some time in the period 1553-1558.

---

[1] Hastings Robinson (ed.), _The Zurich Letters comprising the correspondence of several English Bishops and Others with some of the Helvetian Reformers, during the reign of Queen Elizabeth_ (2 vols; Cambridge: The University Press, 1842-1845), II, p. 152. Hereafter referred to as _ZL_.

One might legitimately ask at this point: Is it to be concluded that all of these men were devotees of the Tigurine viewpoint? This question is most difficult to answer. In the first place it must be remembered that these said exiles did not settle in Zurich for the duration. Like the remainder of the exiles they moved about the continent visiting the other exilic centers. Strassburg, Frankfort, and Geneva witnessed a constant stream of Englishmen moving to and fro through their gates. It is therefore difficult to assess with any degree of certainty the influence of Zurich over that of Geneva or any other city. Certainly length of residence in most cases is not a clue to the answer. However there are a few cases, like that of Parkhurst, who spent the entire exile in Zurich, where the evidence is more conclusive.

In the second place, we are frustrated from a lack of evidence in discerning other criteria on which to make a comparison and judgment. For example, there is no evidence that theology was a point of dissent. On the contrary, there is rather good evidence for concluding that all the exiles stood within the Reformed theological tradition. The one disruptive element which caused grave concern to all the exiles was worship. Could the Book of Common Prayer (1552) be used by the English in exile? That was the issue. In the summer of 1554, after getting settled, the Frankfort congregation modified the Book of Common Prayer to the end that it might be more in line with biblical injunctions. English exiles in other centers were thereupon invited to join them in their unique situation. In October the Zurich students issued a joint letter.[1] They stated that they were very happy where they were and had been liberally provided for by the ministers and magistrates of Zurich. They acknowledged their willingness to join the Frankfort congregation on the condition that "ye think, and that before God, that our absence on the one part should greatly hinder, and our presence . . . very much further, your godly attempts . . . for the furnishing of that church so happily obtained."[2] In conclusion they affirmed their determination, if they came, to adhere strictly to the unabridged Book of Common Prayer (1552) and would admit none other. Throughout, the letter expresses a great reluctance on their part to break up their fellowship, to disrupt their studies and to abandon their "godly purposes." This was consistently their attitude throughout the controversy. At no time did they take the side of Whittingham and Knox. At the same time Bullinger's position (if we accept the account of the Brief Discourse, and since we have no other account, we must) seems to have been favorable to those in support of the Second Prayer Book, though it would appear that he was critical of certain portions of it.[1] Thus his position in the controversy is rather ambiguous. The matter is complicated further when we discover that several of the Tigurine exiles in later months spent some time with the exiles in Geneva obviously in complete harmony with the structure of Church polity and worship established there. Does this represent a shift in their attitude or simply an inconsistency on their part? In the final analysis our original question cannot be answered by pursuing this line of inquiry.

---

[1] Whittingham, op. cit., p. 32.

[2] Ibid.

Testimonies from the exiles in later years give a kind of evidence which may be useful. There is abundant evidence that the years spent in Zurich in study were extremely happy ones for the Englishmen. Repeatedly Bullinger and the Tigurine divines received letters abounding in praise of Zurich and expressing the urgent desire to recapture those months of contentment and happiness. For example, Cole, writing to Gualter, stated: "The kindness, most honored Sir, which I experienced from you beyond all others at Zurich, can never escape from my memory; wherefore I wish you to believe, that, although I am very far removed from you in person, in mind and inclination I shall always be a Zuricher."[2] Parkhurst wrote to Bullinger on April 28, 1562: "Can I indeed be forgetful of my Zurich friends . . . ? If but a Zurich dog should come over to me . . . I would make the most of him, and not treat him after dog-fashion."[1] Jewel wrote to Martyr in the same spirit: "For we are all of us hitherto as strangers at home. Return then, you will say, to Zurich. Most earnestly do I wish, my father, that this may sometime be possible: for, so far as I can see, there is no hope of your ever coming to England. O Zurich! Zurich! how much oftener do I now think of thee than ever I thought of England when I was at Zurich."[2] Such are a sampling of the numerous expressions of affection for Zurich and its church leaders. Men so exceedingly happy could not have gone uninfluenced by the Tigurine way of life.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 75.

[2] ZL, II, p. 222.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, I, pp. 107-108.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 23.

CHAPTER VI

ANGLO-TIGURINE RELATIONS 1559-1575

Introduction

The reformation of the ecclesiastical structure did not begin immediately upon the accession of Elizabeth. Indeed the new sovereign prohibited any innovation in religion until she was sufficiently in control of her kingdom to repel any possible aggression of her catholic opposition on the continent. Indeed controversialists of whatever stripe who attempted to agitate the religious problem were severely rebuked and punished. By late January, 1559, a stability had been reached which permitted the government to proceed with the alteration. Within three months the religious settlement had passed the houses of parliament, and the structure of the Elizabethan church was established.

Two parliamentary acts constituted the legal side of the new church. In April, 1559, the Act of Supremacy became law. Thereby the church in England once again severed its ties with Rome and Elizabeth was proclaimed the only "supreme governor" in all matters spiritual and temporal. Therewith was united to the crown all spiritual and ecclesiastical jurisdictions and privileges "for the visitation of the ecclesiastical state and persons, and for reformation, order, and correction of the same."[1] To implement the act an oath of supremacy was demanded of all ecclesiastics of whatever grade and of all governmental employees. Governmental commissioners were appointed to carry out the provisions of the law.

Within days after the passage of the Act of Supremacy, Parliament approved the Act of Uniformity. That measure declared the second Book of Common Prayer (1552), with certain modifications, to be the only authorized book of worship for use in the Church of England. Significantly it was ordered that all such ornaments as were in the second year of Edward were to be retained until modified upon the advice of the commissioners to be appointed or after consultation with the metropolitan of the realm. If contempt or irreverence for the book was expressed by the people, these same commissioners with the consent of the crown were empowered to "ordain and publish such further ceremonies or rites, as may be most for the advancement of God's glory, the edifying of His church, and the due reverence of Christ's holy mysteries and sacraments."[2]

By mid-summer a commission had been issued to eighteen men, none of whom were clerics, whose job it was to administer the oath of supremacy to all those under law ordered to receive it. Those first approached were the sixteen Marian bishops who constituted the leadership of the church at that time.[1] The bishops to whom the oath was tendered between June and November were the same men who had voted unanimously against the religious alteration in parliament. Consistent with their previous witness, they now refused the oath, except Kitchin of Landaff, and were, therefore deprived of their sees. The parochial clergy, on the other hand, except for a few individuals, passed into the service of the establishment without protest.

---

[1] Henry Gee and William John Hardy (eds.), Documents Illustrative of English Church History (London: Macmillan and Co., 1921), p. 447.

[2] Ibid., p. 446.

As each day passed it became imperative that sympathetic leadership be appointed to give guidance to the new church. To whom would Elizabeth show her favor? The basis on which she made her appointments is not clear. Obviously she would not select any sympathetic to the old order. Thus from the exiles she was forced to select the largest portion of the church's leadership. But even there she was forced to be cautious. Since the works of Knox and Goodman against women rulers and in support of revolution had been published in Geneva, Elizabeth was understandably suspicious of all who had drunk too deeply of the Genevan tradition. Probably she believed that Calvin's theology logically led to such conclusions, and toward that political philosophy she was most strenuously opposed. Hence she chose her new episcopi from two groups of Protestants: (1) those who had remained hidden in England during Mary's reign, and who were fortunate enough and clever enough to avoid a challenge to their faith by the Marian authorities; and (2) those exiles who represented a more "liberal" position in practical matters of church government, discipline and worship. Among the exiles, those who had been sympathetic with the Coxian position in the struggles at Frankfort were the ones whom Elizabeth preferred.

---

[1] There were twenty-six episcopal sees in England at this time. The remaining ten sees were vacant, due primarily to the deaths of their occupants.

From the first group Elizabeth selected her Archbishop of Canterbury, Matthew Parker--a man who wished desperately to avoid public service and who desired nothing more than to spend his life in study. But Elizabeth would have her way, and so Parker assumed the leadership of a church of a doubtful hybrid construction and not expected to endure for that very reason. Shortly after his consecration in December, 1559, he presided at the consecration of several exiles selected by the crown to fill the vacant sees and to share with him the leadership of the new church. Those raised to episcopal rank were: Grindal to London (1559); Cox to Ely (1559); Sandys to Worcester (1559); Merrick to Bangor (1559); Young to St. David's (1560); Davies to St. Asaph (1560); Jewel to Salisbury (1560); Pilkington to Durham (1560); Berkeley to Bath and Wells (1560); Bentham to Coventry and Lichfield (1560); Parkhurst to Norwich (1560); Horne to

Winchester (1561). Thus by the end of 1560 the reconstruction of the church was completed.

Zurich and the Puritan Struggles

The news of Mary's death and of the accession of Elizabeth reached Zurich in late November, 1558.[1] The few Englishmen still resident there--Sandys, Jewel, Parkhurst--like other English exiles across the continent, immediately made their plans to return home. Sandys departed in early December,[2] followed in mid-January by Jewel and Parkhurst.[3] Like Hooper a decade before they carried with them the well-wishes of the Tigurine churchmen and the promise to aid their efforts in establishing a godly church in England.

No sooner was the promise given than the Tigurine reformers set about to fulfill it. In mid-December Bullinger and Martyr initiated letters to Elizabeth designed to influence the settlement.[4] Though Bullinger's letter is no longer extant, that of Martyr remains, revealing the intention and character of their labors.[5] His introductory comments reminded the Queen that she had received the crown only by divine providence in order that "the elect of God may . . . be delivered from the hand of their enemies and serve the holy God in all holiness, according to the ordinance of holy writ . . . ."[1] Lest she not achieve that goal, he warned her against any endeavor which would seek "to bear the ark of the gospel, not by the Word of God and the example of purer life, but on the wagons of useless ceremony and the mean work of hirelings."[2] In conclusion he challenged her to lead the way, even if the bishops and ministers lagged, in establishing the reign of God in England.

---

[1] Gorham, op. cit., p. 381.

[2] ZL, II, p. 1.

[3] Ibid., II, p. 3; I, p. 6.

[4] Ibid., II, p. 13. In February, 1559, Sir Anthony Cook wrote of their reception in these exaggerated terms: "How exceedingly she was affected by them, Cecil bears witness, who saw her tears arise as she was reading them." (ZL, II, p. 13.).

[5] Gorham, op. cit., pp. 383-390.

Rodolph Gualter, Bullinger's foster-son and the minister of St. Peter's Church, Zurich, threw his support behind the cause in mid-January, 1559. He wrote three important letters: to Queen Elizabeth; to Francis Russell, a privy Counselor; and to Richard Masters, physician to the queen.[3] In his letter to the queen,[4] Gualter congratulated the English people on having a monarch raised by God to rule his people, and the church of Christ in having found so diligent a "nursing mother." Addressing himself to the reformation of the church, he implored the queen to follow two imperatives: "first, that every reformation of the church and of religion be conducted agreeably to the word of God; and next, that no opportunity be afforded to any among your counsellors . . . either entirely to hinder this most holy and of all things most necessary work, or at least to persuade you that it should be deferred."[1] He was especially earnest in pleading with her to avoid a half-way reformation. "We assuredly know it to be impossible ever to consult the peace of the churches, or the purity of religion, as long as any relics of superstition are retained."[2] The dangers, he insisted, were obvious: (1) the weak would ascribe to the elements of superstition more than was right, (2) the ignorant would stumble, and (3) the Catholics would gain hope of restoring superstition. In conclusion he commended to the queen his good friend, John Parkhurst, one of the exiles, for any favor she might confer upon him in the new church.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 385.

[2] Ibid., p. 387.

[3] Most likely these letters were taken to England by John Parkhurst.

[4] ZL, II, pp. 3-8.

To Francis Russell, Gualter directed the same theme.[3] He congratulated him on his appointment as a privy counselor, and urged him to remember one important principle in the tasks committed to his care: "Those things which relate to the church and to religion are nowhere to be sought for but from the fountains of Holy Scripture."[1] In conclusion Parkhurst was recommended again as a pious man who could give good advice in matters of the church.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 8-11.

In his third letter,[2] to Richard Masters, Gualter sought to renew an old friendship which had been made years before when the latter made a brief journey to England. As in the other letters, he charged his friend to counsel against "a form of religion of a mixed, uncertain, and doubtful character . . . from which the return to papistical superstition and idolatry is afterwards most easy."[3] The Lutheran churches were pointed out as evidence of those who would have a half-way reformation and were therefore to be regarded with suspicion. Again Parkhurst was recommended for any preferment which might be accorded him.

Thus in the early days of Elizabeth's reign these Tigurine churchmen sought to exert their influence to effect a reformation in England consistent with their own theological presuppositions. The essence of their argument and the authority which they cited were to be preached repeatedly by Englishmen as they sought to alter the face of the English Church.

Meanwhile the exiles were arriving in London eager to lend their efforts in the eradication of popery. Reports reaching Zurich indicated that their arrival "was very acceptable to the queen, and that she has openly declared her satisfaction."[1] It was believed that Elizabeth favored a reform of the church, and that it was merely a matter of time before the change would be made. Jewel wrote Martyr on March 20, 1559:

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. 10.

[2] _Ibid._, pp. 11-13.

[3] _Ibid._, pp. 11-12.

> The queen . . . though she openly favors our cause, yet is wonderfully afraid of allowing any innovations; this is owing partly to her own friends, by whose advice everything is carried on, and partly to the influence of Count Feria, a Spaniard, and Philip's ambassador. She is however prudently; and firmly, and piously following up her purpose, though somewhat more slowly than we could wish.[2]

In the meantime the Catholic opposition within the church used every available means to thwart the expected reforms. Cognizant that the troubles at Frankfort revealed an element of disunity among the exiles, the Catholic hierarchy seized upon that incident to hinder the change. In reply to the charge of disunity a group of the exiles[3] set forth a confession of their faith as evidence to the queen that in matters of doctrine they were in one accord. An introductory statement spoke to the accusations made against them: "We have neither swerved from the infallible truth of God's written Word, neither yet from the doctrine and confession of Christ's catholic church; as we by God's grace shall be able and ready at all times evidently to show unto all men."[1] One particular portion of this confession is of singular importance:

---

[1] Ibid., I, p. 6.

[2] Ibid., p. 10.

[3] The exact constituency of this group is unknown. Jewel makes reference to the confession in a letter dated April 28, 1559 (ZL, I, p. 21). Two weeks before in another letter (ZL, I, p. 18) is a statement which might be a clue to the problem: "Sandys, Grindal, Sampson, Scory, (and why should I particularize these?) All of us remain still in London."

> It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one or utterly alike. For at all times they have been diverse and may be changed not only by General Councils but also by particular churches, according to the diversities of the countries and men's manners, so that they be not against God's word, and make to edification.[2]

This statement written in early April, 1559, was to become a cardinal principle of the Anglican apologetic once the Settlement was complete. Significantly it came from men who would later give leadership to the Elizabethan church. Reporting to Martyr of this confession, Jewel made this important statement regarding its contents: "We have not departed in the slightest degree from the confession of Zürich."[3] Indeed this was true. In later years when Geneva was agitating against the settlement, it was Gualter of Zurich who expressed his irritation at those who would force all the reformed churches into the Genevan mold. Writing to Sandys he said:

---

[1] John Strype, Annals of the Reformation (7 vols.; Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1824), I, Part I, p. 170.

[2] Richard Watson Dixon, History of the Church of England from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction (6 vols.; London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1878), V, p. 113.

[3] ZL, I, p. 21.

> God hath indeed adorned that church [Geneva] with diverse excellent gifts, and the ministers thereof. Among whom master Beza I have always reverenced and loved; and do so still. But yet I would wish them modestus et humilius sapere: and not seek to draw their shoe upon every man's foot . . . .[1]

The exiles were correct when they observed: "For where as all the Reformed churches differ among themselves in diverse Ceremonies, and yet agree in the unity of Doctrine; we see no inconvenience, if we use some Ceremonies diverse from them, so that we agree in the chief points of our Religion."[2]

Meanwhile Bullinger, being of the opinion that the exiles were in positions of influence and thereby able to direct the course of the reformation, wrote to all his English friends through Jewel urging them to "act with firmness and resolution."[3] Thereby he believed the pure reformation they all desired could be accomplished. Certainly such an opportunity should not be squandered. In England, however, ecclesiastical affairs were not moving as rapidly nor as consistently toward the goal which the exiles desired. "This dilatoriness has grievously damped the spirits of our brethren," wrote Jewel in April, "while it has wonderfully encouraged the rage and fury of our opponents."[4] More frustrating than anything to them was the degree to which they were being ignored. Instead of assisting in the formation of the new church, they reported that they were treated "as strangers at home."[1]

---

[1] Strype, Annals, II, i, p. 470.

[2] Troubles at Frankfort, p. 225.

[3] ZL, I, p. 32.

[4] Ibid., p. 17.

Early in May, after the dissolution of Parliament, Bullinger and the other Tigurine churchmen were informed of the provisions of the settlement. Jewel reported:

> Religion is again placed on the same footing on which it stood in king Edward's time; to which event, I doubt not, but that your own letters and exhortations, and those of your republic, have powerfully contributed.[2]

In great dissatisfaction, Jewel termed the new church "a leaden mediocrity."[3] He assured his readers that "the doctrine is everywhere most pure," but in regard to "ceremony and maskings, there is little too much foolery."[4] Writing to Martyr he said:

> [Regarding] the scenic apparatus of divine worship . . . those very things which you and I have so often laughed at, are now seriously and solemnly entertained by certain persons, . . . as if the Christian religion could not exist without something tawdry.[5]

Such was the general reaction among the exiles toward the provision in the Act of Uniformity which established the ornaments "in use as was in the Church of England, by authority of parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI, ..."[1] It was probably at this time that the exiles marked out for episcopal preferment were forced to make an important decision: could they conscientiously assume the proffered posts and thereby wear the objectionable habits? In later years Grindal wrote to Bullinger of their concern in those early months:

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 23.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 33.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 23.

> We who are now bishops, on our first return, and before we entered on our ministry, contended long and earnestly for the removal of those things that have occasioned the present dispute; but as we were unable to prevail, either with the queen or the parliament, we judged it best, after a consultation on the subject, not to desert our churches for the sake of a few ceremonies . . . especially since the pure doctrine of the gospel remained in all its integrity and freedom; . . . .[2]

Their contention against the vestments was not on the ground that they were impious, superstitious or contrary to God's word, but on the ground that they were superfluous, "tawdry" and unnecessary. Later a radical group of the exiles would see them as blasphemous because they lacked a biblical warranty and therefore were intolerable in a godly church. But Jewel and his associates could in all good faith tolerate them while actively seeking to have them removed.

Martyr, writing in reply, expressed great disappointment that "the relics of the Amorites" would have a place in the Church and counseled his former student to have them removed immediately. To which Jewel replied (November 5, 1559): "And I wish that sometime or other they may be taken away, and extirpated even to the lowest roots: neither my voice nor my exertions shall be wanting to effect that object."[1] In the meantime Sandys, in a letter to Parker, expressed the conditional acceptance of the vestments by many of the exiles on these terms: "Our gloss upon the text [Act of Uniformity] is, that we shall not be forced to use them [vestments] but that others in the meantime shall not convey them away, but that they may remain for the Queen."[2] Thus from the outset the settlement bore the seeds of dissatisfaction and unrest. Even those men who would later serve as leaders and apologists for the church expressed deep regret that England was not to have a church uncumbered by the accretions of the centuries.

---

[1] Gee and Hardy, op. cit., p. 446.

[2] ZL, II, pp. 11-12.

But not all the exiles felt they could conscientiously assume the ministerial office and therewith give the appearance of approving the new church with all its ordinances. Shortly after Elizabeth's accession and weeks before the structure of the new church was formed, Thomas Sampson, an exile in Strassburg, wrote Martyr in Zurich posing certain questions which would indicate he feared a radical reformation was impossible.[1] Martyr's answer is lost, but six months later he expressed his views to a correspondent who expressed similar fears.[2] His letter is the first comment we have from the Tigurine churchmen of their attitude toward the new Elizabethan church. Obviously the correspondent had informed Zurich of the prescribed vestments and further detailed that crucifixes, candles, altars, and images were still in use throughout the realm. Martyr's reply posed the dilemma which all the exiles faced: if they refused the ministerial office because vestments and the like were authorized, they might lose the leadership of the church and therewith the opportunity in the future to order things according to their own principles. On the other hand, to assume the office under such conditions might make it appear that all those things were approved and would destroy any possibility in the future to change the patterns. Martyr's answer was much more rigid than that expressed by him a decade before in Hooper's controversy: "For he whose teaching is at variance with his actions, builds up the things that he destroys, and in like manner destroys the things that he builds up."[3] "I would that those who have thought fit that these things should be preserved, had perceived that, as long as they remain, the gospel is not sufficiently established. Truly, if we hated superstitious from the heart, we should endeavor by all means that their very vestiges should be rooted out."[1] In conclusion, he gave his reader two pieces of advice: first, he was not to abandon the ministry, but to retain the office and "declaim against rites which are full of offence and occasions of falling;"[2] second, he must abstain from the administration of the sacraments until the offences be removed. Indicating his was not an isolated judgment, Martyr concluded: "The same is also the opinion of the reverend and most excellent master Bullinger."[3]

---

[1] ZL, I, p. 52.

[2] John Bruce and Thomas Perowne (eds.), Correspondence of Matthew Parker ("The Parker Society"; Cambridge: The University Press, 1853), p. 65.

---

[1] ZL, I, p. 1.

[2] Ibid., II, pp. 25-27.

[3] Ibid., p. 25.

In late August (1559) Sampson again addressed a letter to Martyr requesting advice which Martyr gave in his reply of November 4.[4] Regarding the vestments Martyr reversed his stand from that expressed in the previous July: "I think you ought not to contend more than is necessary; for superstition does not properly seem to have anything to do therein."[1] Martyr further stated that this did not mean he approved of the vestments, but the greater evil of the exiles being deprived had to be avoided. He indicated, however, that Bullinger did not share his views, and that the latter counseled the English "not [to] use them, lest a thing that occasions offence may be sanctioned by your example."[2] Both were agreed, however, that under no circumstances must a minister officiate where altars and images were retained. In conclusion he urged Sampson to make decisions on his own and not to imitate the past actions of anyone. It is so difficult, he lamented, to give advice on such complex issues at such a long distance.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 26.

[2] Ibid., p. 27.

[3] Ibid. Here the important point should be made that generally a letter from an Englishman to a Tigurine divine or vice versa was not regarded as personal correspondence. News of English church affairs written to Martyr was intended for the edification of all Tigurine clerics. The difficulty of transporting mail across such long distances, plus the great cost of doing so dictated the necessity of this system. Since Martyr had been such a close associate of Englishmen, it was natural that letters would be directed to him. When he died, Bullinger was the chief Tigurine correspondent with Englishmen.

[4] Ibid., pp. 32-33.

In the autumn of 1559, the evangelicals, both exiles and non-exiles, were startled at the latest change in the royal chapel. In preparation for a wedding to be held on October 5, the queen ordered a crucifix and two candles to be placed upon the altar. The evangelicals immediately lodged a protest with the monarch. Parker joined with the bishops in petitioning the queen to "purge the polluted church, and remove all occasions of evil."[3] After a lengthy discourse on the evils of images with numerous citations from scripture and history, the bishops pleaded:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 32.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Correspondence of Matthew Parker, p. 79.

> We beseech your Highness most humbly not to strain us any further; but to consider, that God's word doth threaten a terrible judgment unto us, if we, being pastors and ministers in his Church, should assent to the thing, which in our learning and conscience we are persuaded doth tend to the confirmation of error, superstition and idolatry, and finally, to the ruin of the souls committed to our charge, for the which we must give an accompt to the Prince of pastors at the last day.[1]

The protest continued unabated for several months. Evangelicals feared that in time there would be a general restitution of those ornaments throughout the church. Indeed, the entire Settlement appeared to be near collapse. Jewel wrote to Martyr in despair (November 16):

> That little silver cross, of ill-omened origin, still maintains its place in the queen's chapel. Wretched me! this thing will soon be drawn into a precedent. There was at one time some hope of its being removed; and we all of us diligently exerted ourselves, and still do, that it might be so. But as far as I can perceive, it is now a hopeless case.[2]

Fearful that a complete disruption was imminent, Jewel expressed the possibility that he might need to return to Zurich in exile.

On January 6, Sampson penned another letter to his Tigurine friends.[3] At the outset he expressed his appreciation for the advice rendered him by Martyr and Bullinger. He reported however that matters were becoming worse with every day:

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 93-94.

[2] ZL, I, 55.

[3] Ibid., p. 62.

> What can I hope, when three of our lately appointed bishops are to officiate at the table of the Lord, one as priest, another as deacon, and a third as sub-deacon, before the image of the crucifix, or at least not far from it, with candles, and habited in the golden vestments of the papacy; and are thus to celebrate the Lord's supper without any sermon? What hope is there of any good, when our friends are disposed to look for religion in these dumb remnants of idolatry, and not in the preaching of the lively word of God?[1]

The question was then asked: can candles and crucifixes placed on an altar be tolerated by Christian ministers? Sampson wished an answer from Martyr, Bullinger, and Ochino. Personally, Sampson expressed his view that a minister should suffer deprivation rather than conduct worship under such circumstances.[2] Surely, he concluded, they could not be regarded as matters indifferent as "certain of our friends" regard them.

Thus one year after the accession of Elizabeth and the return of the exiles to their native land, the lines of conflict in the Anglican church for years to come were discernible. As we have seen, the provisions of the Settlement were not enthusiastically received by any of the exiles. Having experienced what Dixon calls "the nakedness of Zurich and Geneva,"[3] the new ecclesia anglicana appeared to them to

---

[1] Ibid., p. 63.

[2] Ibid., p. 64.

[3] History of the Church of England, VI, p. 43.

retain much that was superfluous and unnecessary, other things that were "manifestly impious" and would have fostered open revolt if pressed on the new church. All the exiles were committed to a further reformation. It was the unnecessary and tawdry features, specifically the vestments, which occasioned a split within the exilic ranks. Those exiles appointed to episcopal posts, following the advice of Martyr, assumed their offices with the intention of reforming the church in time. Others like Sampson had great reservation regarding the wisdom of such action and were critical of the bishops for assuming their office. Both groups appealed to Zurich for advice. Interestingly the Zurich divines were not of one accord in their views. Repeating the advice he had given Hooper, Bullinger urged the exiles to avoid any practice which would place them in a position of sanctioning superstition, especially officiating before crucifixes and lighted tapers, but also the use of vestments. Thus at this early date, Bullinger's advice was a comfort to the emerging extreme Puritan faction. Martyr's advice, on the other hand, reflected a concern for expediency, as it had in the controversy with Hooper, and became the program for the episcopal exiles. Thus both segments of the exiles called upon Zurich for advice, and both found there support for their respective positions.

An important letter was written by Martyr to Sampson on February 1, 1560.[1] More urgently than ever Martyr stressed the expedient factors: "I exhort you . . . not to withdraw yourself from the function offered you: for if you [do] . . . you will give place to wolves and Antichrists."[1] Especially important was his advice to wear the vestments in preaching or administering the supper "provided . . . you persist in speaking and teaching against the use of them."[2] In conclusion he added the significant line: "Upon the whole matter I have conferred with Master Bullinger, who both gives his consent, and sends you his hearty salutations."[3] Thus it was that Bullinger's strong conservative stand on the vestments was modified. Henceforth the voice of Zurich was one; a voice congenial in almost every respect to Anglican episcopal views and progressively irritating to the extreme Puritan elements. As the months passed the rift became even greater. Zurich was more and more viewed as a supporter of the establishment, while Geneva was looked to by the more restive conservative spirits.

---

[1] ZL, II, pp. 38-41.

Pointing to those men who assumed episcopal posts, Knappen has correctly observed that "they tended to lose their Puritan attitude" and this because "the responsibilities of office tended to make them conservative."[4] In the early months of 1560 this was especially true of Archbishop Parker and Bishop Cox of Ely. To the dismay of such men as Jewel and Grindal, Parker and Cox were counseling submission to the crown on the crucifixes and images. At the height of the controversy the council ordered a full-scale debate of the issue. Of that dispute between Parker and Cox on one side, and Grindal and Jewel on the other, Jewel wrote to Martyr:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 38.

[2] Ibid., p. 39.

[3] Ibid., p. 40.

[4] M. M. Knappen, Tudor Puritanism (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1939), pp. 179-180.

> I smile . . . when I think with what grave and solid reasons they will defend their little cross . . . . As far as I can conjecture, I shall not again write to you as a bishop. For matters are come to that pass, that either the crosses of silver and tin, which we have everywhere broken in pieces, must be restored, or our bishoprics relinquished.[1]

Such was the gravity of the crisis. However, by this time the government realized the strength and determination of its opposition. The result was a victory for neither side. The queen retained the crucifix and candles in her chapel, but the practice was not forced on the remainder of the church. Hence the reforming party, thankful to have achieved the latter, was content to leave the queen and her liturgical accessories in peace--temporarily. Meanwhile they attacked unceasingly all the vestiges of "popery," ignored the demand for vestiarian conformity, and looked to the day when they could initiate a complete reformation by legal means.

By the fall of 1562 financial matters forced the crown to call a parliament to meet on January 11, 1563. The Commons contained twenty-four exiles of influence[1] while in the Lords sat the new Elizabethan bishops. Simultaneously with that body sat the Convocation for the Province of Canterbury in St. Paul's. The convocation, which in 1559 had been predominantly Catholic, in 1563 reflected the more radical spirit of the exiles. Thus it was hoped that many of the grievances which had been tolerated since 1559 would there find legal remedy. But Elizabeth was still mistress of her realm and governor of the establishment. Her wishes were not at all in accord with further reform and thus she effectively blocked all moves in that direction. The more radical reformers, who in these years were the nuclei of the later Puritan party, were angered by their containment and unjustly blamed the bishops for their frustrated efforts.

---

[1] ZL, I, p. 68.

All the while each clergyman went his separate way wearing that which conscience dictated, often in complete defiance of the Act of Uniformity. Certainly the Anglican hierarchy had no intention of demanding conformity, nor could the crown, if it so wished, have enforced the law due to more pressing problems in other areas which dominated its attention. Nevertheless, for a godly nation to have a law which sanctioned superstition was unthinkable in Puritan eyes and every effort had to be made to eradicate it. As if to launch a new effort in that direction, Laurence Humphrey in July, 1563, rushed a letter off to Bullinger requesting an opinion on the same tired vestiarian problems. After enumerating the questions, he posed the revealing question: "To the pure, then, can all these things be pure, and matters of indifference?"[1] If Bullinger answered, his letter has been lost. Meanwhile Bishop Horn, one of the Tigurine exiles, wrote Bullinger a report expressing his disappointment that no change had been made in the ecclesiastical law by the recent parliament. Though unhappy with some of the rites and ceremonies, he proudly pointed out that "we have throughout England the same ecclesiastical doctrine as yourselves."[2] He pointed out in conclusion that "we have never ceased, according to your advice, to teach, warn, and enforce what is right and necessary to be followed from the holy scriptures."[3]

---

[1] John E. Neale, Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments, 1559-1581 (New York: British Book Centre, [1952], p. 90.

By the spring of 1564 Elizabeth had successfully coped with most of her non-ecclesiastical problems. Thus she was free to turn her attention to the rebellious church. After a visit to Cambridge in the fall where she was exposed to an infinite variety of nonconformity, Elizabeth let it be known to Parker and the other bishops that she intended to have conformity of clerical attire. Parker thereupon began negotiations with Sampson, Dean of Christ Church College, and

---

[1] ZL, I, p. 134.

[2] Ibid., p. 135.

[3] Ibid.

Humphrey, President of Magdalen College, Oxford, most ardent and capable proponents of the Puritan point of view. His attempts at persuasion were unavailing. The answers given to the ten questions he addressed to them are revealing.[1] Admitting that the vestments were in themselves matters indifferent, they insisted, however, that because of their association with papistry they could no longer be considered indifferent. Thus they had to be avoided. Nevertheless, they were willing to permit those who wished to do so to wear them, provided they in turn were not forced to don them.

Such was not to be the case, however. The queen had decreed conformity and the era of laxity was at an end. The Puritans on the other hand were equally as ardent in their determination to resist. In between were caught the bishops. Obviously, for many of them there was no problem. But for others, such as Jewel, Parkhurst, Grindal, Pilkington, and Horn, there was real conflict. Basically their sympathies lay with the objectives of the Puritan faction, but as officers of the crown they were placed in the unenviable position of having to enforce the laws of the land against their friends. Inevitably the two groups began to move away from one another. As emotions deepened each side became more convinced that its views were the only right ones to hold. Again, it was to Zurich which each appealed for justification of its action.

---

[1] John Strype, Parker, I, p. 329.

In July, 1565, Horn in a letter to Gualter summarized the conflict between the bishops and the Puritans.[1] Once again he reiterated the bishops' position: "We complied with this injunction [to wear prescribed vestments], lest our enemies should take possession of the places deserted by ourselves."[2] Four months later Bullinger penned a reply which was to have a profound effect upon the controversy in England. He wrote with obvious reluctance, fearful that he was "most probably unacquainted with all the circumstances."[3] Nevertheless, from a sense of duty he ventured to speak a word on the matter. First, he wanted it known that he approved wholeheartedly the zeal of those who wished the church cleansed from all "the dregs of popery." On the other hand he commended the "prudence" of those who would not abandon their pulpits because of the vestments. Speaking for the latter he pointed out that "the great end of the ministry" was the edification and preservation of the church and that in defending any cause that purpose must not be forgotten.

> Nor are we only to consider what is now that state of the church which we think of forsaking, but also what it will be when we have left it. If it be certain that it will improve, we are at liberty to depart; but if, on the contrary, it will suffer loss, we are not to give place to wicked and

---

[1] ZL, I, pp. 141-143.

[2] Ibid., p. 142.

[3] Ibid., pp. 341-344.

treacherous workmen.[1]

Bullinger believed on the basis of the evidence he had that the latter in reality would take place if the bishops abandoned their posts. Nevertheless, he wished it clearly to be understood that he did not approve of those laws by which the vestments were retained, and they could be tolerated only because the law "expressly provided" that they be not understood in a superstitious sense. Nevertheless, all persons concerned for a pure religion were urged to instruct the queen and her counsellors "no longer to stain and defile a reformation . . . with dregs and filthiness of this kind."[2]

Doubtlessly Bullinger's letter was a boon to the position of the bishops and that of the government likewise. All the while Parker's drive for conformity was meeting greater success. The Puritans in return unleashed a volley of literary missiles in defense of their positions. Hoping also to find support from the continent both Humphrey and Sampson wrote letters to Bullinger in February, 1566.[3] These letters stated once again in the form of succinct questions the issues as the Puritans saw them. Bullinger was asked to reply to each question in turn after consultation with his colleagues. It would appear that Bullinger's reply to their letters was unsatisfactory, possibly because he sought to be non-committal. In any case, there was no mistaking his position as he wrote to them a second time on May 1, 1566.[1] In his introduction he lectured them on their attempt to complicate the problem which was basically a simple one. Promising to answer each question forthrightly and without ambiguity, he informed them that those answers would be the last he would give to their questions.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 342.

[2] Ibid., p. 343.

[3] Ibid., pp. 151-152; pp. 153-155.

> If, therefore, you are disposed to listen to us, and desire our opinion respecting the vestiarian controversy, . . . behold! you possess our opinion in this epistle: in which if you are unable to acquiesce, we are indeed most exceedingly grieved; and since we have no other advice to offer, we heartily and continually pray the Lord . . . that by his grace and power he may provide a remedy for this afflictive state of things.[2]

Having answered their questions point by point he concluded:

> And I also exhort you all, by Jesus Christ our Lord, . . . that every one of you should duly consider with himself, whether he will not more edify the church of Christ by regarding the use of habits for the sake of order and decency, as a matter of indifference, and which hitherto has tended somewhat to the harmony and advantage of the church, than by leaving the church, on account of the vestiarian controversy, to be occupied hereafter, if not by evident wolves, at least by ill-qualified and evil ministers.[3]

Thus the Tigurine church unequivocally placed itself on the side of the bishops in the vestiarian controversy.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 345-355.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 346.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 355.

Meanwhile Bullinger's letter to Horn of the previous November was received with such pleasure that the bishops had it copied and distributed among those who were contending against the vestments.[1] Parkhurst reported that it had been "of great service to many godly preachers and others, who faithfully and diligently perform their ecclesiastical functions."[2] Nevertheless, he went on to say that there were others who refused the counsel and surrendered their office rather than conform. Among these was Thomas Sampson.

By early June, 1566, Bullinger's letter to Humphrey and Sampson had reached its destination. The author also sent copies to Horn, Grindal, Parkhurst, Jewel, Sandy, and Pilkington with a covering letter wherein it was explained that he did not wish to have private correspondence with them "without the knowledge of you, the principal ministers."[3] He further urged the bishops not to be too severe on the Puritans and suggested that the queen once again be petitioned to remove that which was offensive. So well was Bullinger's letter to Humphrey and Sampson received by the bishops that Grindal in London took the liberty of having it published without the author's consent.[4] By late summer Bullinger was informed of what had transpired and assured that as a result of the publication many people, who had been persuaded to abandon the establishment, now had "returned to a better mind."

---

[1] *Ibid.*, II, p. 118.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.*, I, p. 356.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 168.

> Your letter, replete with piety and wisdom, has greatly contributed to this result; for I have taken care that it should be printed, both in Latin and English. Some of the clergy influenced by your judgment and authority, have relinquished their former intention of deserting their ministry. And many also of the laity have begun to entertain milder sentiments, now that they have understood that our ceremonies were by no means considered by you as unlawful, though you do not yourselves adopt them; but of this, before the publication of your letter, no one could have persuaded them.[1]

As one might suspect, the Puritans were considerably angered by the high handedness of the bishops. They, therefore, consolidated their forces and launched a counter-attack. At home they quickly surveyed Bullinger's published writings, selected choice portions which supported their side of the debate and published them under the title, The Judgment of H. Bullinger in Certain Matters of Religion. Shortly thereafter Humphrey and Sampson wrote Bullinger a blistering letter wherein they expressed openly their dissatisfaction with the answers he had given to their previous questions.[2] Step by step they set about to refute his arguments, showing that in his published works he had expressed himself completely to the contrary. The heart of their concern and the reason for their extreme stand they expressed clearly: "to check at the outset what we fear will come to pass in this country."[1] Thus the raging fear in their minds was the revival of Catholicism. There are hints of a later issue to be raised, i.e., can the civil authority legislate for the church. They made the point that in the past ecclesiastical synods and councils had met to solve controversial issues. Thus, "why should everything be now referred to the pleasure of one or two individuals?"[2] Bullinger was also informed that the matter of the vestments was not the only remnant of the popish church against which they were contending. For his information they appended to their letter thirteen "straws and chips" of the popish religion which, they insisted, were still existent in the Church of England. The bishops also received severe criticism because of their frustration of the Puritan efforts.[3] In conclusion they pleaded with Bullinger

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., p. 157.

> that by your paternal advice, public writings, and

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 159.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 162.

[3] "We have always thought well of the bishops; we have put a candid interpretation upon their display of grandeur: why can they not endure us who formerly bore the same cross with them, and who now preach the same Christ, and bear that most delightful yoke together with themselves? Why do they cast us into prison? Why do they persecute us on account of the habits? Why do they spoil us of our property and means of subsistence? Why do they publicly traduce us in their books? Why do they in their published writings commend a bad course to posterity? . . . . So that in pleading their own cause, and vindicating their honour, they neither consult the interests of our church, nor their brethren, nor your dignity, nor the succeeding generation." *ZL*, I, p. 162.

> private letters, you will exert yourself, and be active in effecting either the removal of these evils, or the toleration of those good men who are not yet convinced; lest the Roman ceremonial should disunite those whom the firm bond of doctrine hath joined together.[1]

Fearing that the Tigurine pope was substituting expediency for the gospel truth, their last sentence was a charge: "Do you then not decide upon what _may_ or _can_ be done, but upon what _ought_ to be done."[2]

Realists that they were, the Puritan leaders sought support from other continental sources. As the letter for Bullinger headed toward Switzerland in the hands of a special messenger, Percival Wiburn, it was accompanied by another epistle headed for Geneva and addressed to William Farel, Peter Viret, Theodore Beza, and others.[3] As in the previous letters to Bullinger, this letter stated the Puritan cause and the arguments for its justification. In conclusion three requests were made to the Genevan churchmen:

> Your reply to the questions here proposed by us, and some treatise to all the churches generally; a letter to the bishops privately, and, if you please, to such of her majesty's councillors as you may be acquainted with; so that this whole controversy may issue in a Christian reconciliation, and not in a cruel separation.[4]

By late August, the Puritan messengers, probably

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 163.

[2] _Ibid_.

[3] _Ibid_., II, pp. 121-124.

[4] _Ibid_., p. 123.

George Withers and Percival Wiburn, had reached Geneva on the first lap of their mission. Having presented their epistles to Beza, who was immediately won to the Puritan cause, they set out for Zurich bearing an additional letter for Bullinger from the head of the Genevan church. Beza's letter expressed his belief that "yours [Bullinger's] . . . is the only church by whose authority both the queen and the bishops seem likely to be influenced."[1] He proposed that someone from the Tigurine church, preferably Gualter, be dispatched to England to "solicit from the queen and bishops a remedy for all these evils."[2] If this were not possible, it was suggested that Bullinger write a "grave and copius statement" to the queen and to the bishops, the latter being those "by whom this mischief is fostered," reminding them of their offices and responsibility.

The news conveyed to the Tigurine divines was indeed disturbing to them. The stories of ministerial oppression by the bishops was unbelievable Was Tigurine trust in the Anglican bishops misplaced? Or were the Puritan charges unfounded? To be sure Bullinger and his associates were deeply troubled. Several years later Gualter wrote of their bewilderment at this time:

> Those two men . . . set down in writing a great many errors and superstitions abuses, which they asserted were now maintained in England; and that all such as would not consent thereunto were cast out of their

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 131.

[2] *Ibid*.

> ministry. They added, that their most grievous cause of complaint was this, namely, that most of the bishops had become the willing executors of those things which were daily coined at court by superstitious and ambitious courtiers.
>
> Who would suspect that any persons could be so barefaced, as to dare to lie with such assurance on matters of such notoriety, and the truth of which could not long be concealed? The account given by these men certainly troubled us not a little; . . . .[1]

Beza's suggestion that a Tigurine emissary be sent to England was vetoed, in favor of some strong words to those Anglican bishops who were close friends of the Zurich church leaders. Consequently, on September 6, 1566, Bullinger and Gualter jointly wrote a formal letter of concern to Bishops Grindal and Horn.[2] At the outset a protest was lodged with them over the publication of Bullinger's letter to Humphrey and Sampson earlier in the summer. Especially were they concerned that it was being used to justify conformity to the whole complexity of the English reformation when in fact it encouraged temporary conformity to the vestments alone. The bishops were, thereupon, informed of all the charges brought against the English church by the Puritan delegation. Bullinger and Gualter concluded their letter with this demand:

> We exhort your reverences by the Lord Jesus, that, if the case be as it is reported, you will consult with your episcopal brethren and other holy and prudent men touching the amendment and purification of these and similar superstitions, and faithfully vindicate

---

[1] *Ibid*., II, pp. 363-364.

[2] *Ibid*., I, pp. 357-360.

> us from the injustice inflicted upon us by others. For we have never approved those articles, as they have been reported to us.[1]

Several days later a letter was also written to Humphrey and Sampson.[2] One gets the feeling in reading it that the authors find Puritan charges rather difficult to believe and hence are not willing to express sympathy with them until more of the facts are known. Indeed Humphrey and Sampson are informed that Tigurine opinion on their problems was fully expressed in their previous letter and thus there was nothing more that could be added. "Since we have hitherto failed to convince you, we commit the whole matter to God, and entreat you not to regard us with unkindness, but as friends, ..."[3]

Gualter himself wrote a sharp note to his old friend, John Parkhurst.[4] Lamenting the retention of the papistical elements and practices within the English church, he expressed severe criticism of those bishops who had not protested the defilement and especially of those bishops who had aided in the persecution of those Puritans who had protested. Using a biblical parallel, Gualter continued:

> I wish they [the bishops] would consider what the Lord meant, when he was speaking of the faithless

---

[1] Ibid., p. 359.

[2] Ibid., pp. 360-362.

[3] Ibid., p. 361.

[4] Ibid., II, pp. 140-142.

> steward, who, when he ought have been feeding his household, riots and sports with the drunken, and smites his fellow-servants. For I do not see much difference between his conduct and theirs, who so readily give their sanction to the crochets of superstitious courtiers, and treat godly ministers with so much cruelty. Nor could I ever have imagined that anyone could have been found among the bishops, who would allow himself either to participate in this wickedness by his instrumentality, or at least to encourage it by his cowardly conivance.[1]

In conclusion he expressed his strong conviction that "their [Puritan] cause is not a bad one, much less a wicked one; nay it were rather to be desired that their views might prevail."[2]

When the letter reached England, Parkhurst liberally shared it with his Puritan friends who joyously found it a boon to their efforts. Though there is no indication that it was printed separately, as Bullinger's earlier letter had been, it was doubtlessly copied many times and read at length by all those of Puritan sympathies. Indeed it was destined to come home to haunt Gualter, for in late 1571 it was appended as a supporting document along with a similar letter from Beza to the First Admonition to Parliament. Thus Gualter's private letter to Parkhurst wherein, as he testified later, he had thought himself "at liberty to act more freely on account of our ancient friendship"[3] became a pawn in the increasing struggle between Puritanism and its opposition.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 141.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

To Miles Coverdale a letter was also written that day by Bullinger[1] in which he expressed his grave concern that his letters were complicating matters rather than aiding a solution. He confided that he planned to write to some Englishmen of influence who "will faithfully exert themselves that the liberty of the churches remain unimpaired, and that faithful ministers be not persecuted, and that the church of England be again purified from those things which are foreign to the purity of true religion."[2]

How many Englishmen of influence, apart from the bishops just mentioned, received epistles from Bullinger and Gualter in this crisis is not known. At least one is extant. Of others, if such there were, we know nothing. On September 11, Bullinger and Gualter penned a letter to Francis Russell, the Earl of Bedford.[3] Therein Bedford was urged to exert his influence with the queen and the nobility "that the reformation of the church of England, begun with the great admiration of the whole world, be not disfigured by new filth and the restored relics of wretched popery."[4]

The year 1566 came to a close with Tigurine churchmen somewhat confused as to the state of affairs in English

---

[1] _Ibid._, pp. 136-137.

[2] _Ibid._, p. 137.

[3] _Ibid._, pp. 137-140.

[4] _Ibid._, p. 139.

Christendom. Believing the recent reports that remnants of popery still remained with the Church of England to have some foundation in fact, their faith was greatly shaken in their episcopal friends who seemed to be responsible for the irregularities.

By February, 1567, replies to the Tigurine letters were on their way to Zurich. Grindal and Horn jointly wrote a lengthy letter to Bullinger and Gualter on February 6.[1] Therein they expressed astonishment at the abuses reported to be rampant in the English church. To their knowledge, they reported, "no differences of opinion accepting in this affair of the habits have hitherto arisen among our brethren."[2] Explanation in detail was then given of their position on the vestments.

> But if we were to acquiesce in the inconsiderate advice of our brethren . . . to attack the habits by law established . . . or else all lay down our offices at once; verily we should have a papistical, or at least a Lutherano-papistical ministry or none at all. But, honored brethren in Christ, we call Almighty God to witness, that this dissention has not been occasioned by any fault of ours, nor is it owing to us that vestments of this kind have not been altogether done away with: so far from it, that we most solemnly make oath that we have hitherto labored with all earnestness, fidelity, and diligence, to effect what our brethren require, and what we ourselves wish.[3]

The new abuses supposedly rampant within the church were branded "altogether a falsehood." "Nor are those parties more to be depended upon, who either in their written letters, or verbally in your presence, have under the pretext endeavored to blind your eyes, and to brand us with a calumnious accusation."[1] In conclusion each of the supposed excesses was dealt with separately and shown to be false.

---

[1] _Ibid._, I, pp. 175-182.

[2] _Ibid._, p. 176.

[3] _Ibid._, p. 177.

This letter was significant for Anglo-Tigurine relations. Having read it, Bullinger and his associates were convinced that they had been deceived by Puritan propaganda and subterfuge. Indeed they were convinced that Puritan leaders had deliberately lied about the state of ecclesiastical affairs in England in order to win Tigurine support for their cause. They vowed never again to permit themselves to be so misled. Henceforth their trust lay completely with the episcopal leaders of the established church, and Puritans of whatever variety were regarded with grave suspicion. Several years later Gualter was to write: "Since that time we have certainly had nothing to do with those vain brawlers."[2] And indeed they did not. In the summer of 1567 the Puritan faction sent forth its second deputation to woo Swiss support. As in the past, Beza gave his unqualified support and requested Bullinger to do the same. But Bullinger and Gualter refused to become entangled again. The Puritan embassy was informed in unambiguous terms that Tigurine faith rested with the bishops and that further deliberations were useless.[1] Furthermore they were instructed that if other parties were considering a similar appeal, "let them know that they will come to no purpose."[2] Thus it was that Bullinger and his associates became firmly aligned with the established church and its leadership. In years to come when the Puritan protest became stronger under new leadership and a planned program of action, the Tigurine voice was unswerving in its loyalty to the Anglican bishops. Recognizing the dimensions of the situation, Puritan leaders looked exclusively to Geneva for support and encouragement. Thus it was that John Calvin's influence became dominant in Elizabethan Puritanism.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 178.

[2] Ibid., p. 364.

Bullinger and the Papal Bull of 1570

If Anglican authorities and Puritans failed to agree on the structure of the established church, they were of one mind in their opposition to Roman Catholicism. Indeed, for them the papacy was the incarnation of the Antichrist. Hence they were unrelenting in their opposition to it and for all it stood. Here they had the active, though not always open, support of Elizabeth herself. In the sixteenth century the political arm of the Vatican was a justified reason for suspicion and fear. Many a living Englishman could remember the pope calling upon a Catholic prince to subdue a recalcitrant noble. It was not impossible that the pope once again would invite the Emperor to field an army against the English queen who had broken with the church. Certainly Catholic infiltration was everywhere present. But Pius IV (1559-1565) was also a diplomat and thus he first sought to woo England's taunting virgin back to the mother Church by various condescending overtures. To none was she responsive. His successor, Pius V (1566-1572), abandoned that policy in 1570 and forthwith issued a writ of excommunication, declaring Elizabeth a heretic and absolving her subjects of all fealty, allegiance and obedience.[1]

---

[1] ZL, II, p. 154.

[2] Ibid., p. 155.

When the news reached England, there was a general rallying in support of the crown. Many expressed outrage that a foreign prince would interfere in the internal affairs of the English nation. Typical of the age, it was felt that some person should answer the papal attack with a printed defense of the English church.

In July, 1570, Cox wrote Bullinger of the latest papal move and concluded his letter with the request that Bullinger turn his attention to the matter.[2] Later in the summer Jewel provided him with a copy of the bull which had been secretly smuggled into England earlier in the year. It would appear that at some time that summer a definite request was made of Bullinger by Grindal, Cox, and Jewel that he write a refutation of the pope's bull.[1] By February, 1571, Bullinger had accomplished the task assigned to him. With a covering letter[2] he forwarded to Grindal, Cox, and Jewel his manuscript, Bullae papisticae ante biennium contra sereniss. Angliae, Franciae, et Hyberniae reginam Elisabetham, et contra inclytum Angliae regnum promulgatae Refutatio, orthodoxaeque Reginae et universi Regni Angliae defensio Henrychii Bullingeri. In September Parker presented it to the Queen.

---

[1] Philip Hughes, The Reformation in England (3 vols.; London: Hollis and Carter, 1954), III, appendix V, pp. 418-421.

[2] ZL, I, pp. 220-221.

Cox reported that the Queen was exceedingly delighted with the treatise "against that bulled nonsense, and read it with the greatest eagerness." Within weeks it was printed in both English and Latin for general distribution.[3] In time Parkhurst was able to report to Bullinger: "Your most learned refutation of the pope's bull is in the hands of everyone."

Theologically the treatise said nothing new. It began with a reasoned theological attack upon the dogmatic structure of the Roman Church and concluded with an apology for the Church of England and plea for loyalty to the English

---

[1] Bullinger wrote to Grindal, Cox, and Jewel: "But when I understood that I should gratify your reverences by my labours, such as they are, upon this subject, I was unwilling in any measure to disappoint your expectations." ZL, II, p. 179.

[2] Ibid., pp. 178-179.

[3] ZL, I, pp. 268-269.

Queen. For our purposes it is important because it reveals the prestige and authority which Bullinger and the Tigurine Church had in the eyes of the Anglican hierarchy and the English government.

The Prophesyings

The influence of the Tigurine tradition in Elizabethan England is nowhere more apparent than in the literature and educational scheme provided for the education of the clergy.

Earlier in this thesis reference was made to the Zurich prophezei and its relationship to the services of prophecy held in the London Strangers' Churches and to the program of ministerial education established by Hooper in his episcopal areas.[1] This same device was also adapted by Elizabethan churchmen to meet their need for an educated clergy.

Throughout this period the correspondence abounds with references to the illiteracy of the clergy. If the reformation was to succeed, it was recognized that a clergy thoroughly trained in reformation principles was necessary. Knappen is correct when he observed:

> The Reformed system did not depend for its efficiency on the ability of wonder-working priests to terrify an ignorant populace with threats of damnation. It demanded an intelligent understanding and appreciation of a theological system. Without freedom of teaching, the whole structure collapsed.[2]

---

[1] See pp.

[2] Knappen, op. cit., p. 253.

Thus it was necessary to devise some means by which the hundreds of Roman priests who had accomodated themselves to the settlement could be re-educated in their theological thinking and trained to think in Protestant categories. Since it was wholly unrealistic to send these men back to the universities, it bacame necessary to provide some program of on-the-job training. Prophesyings were set up to meet that need.

It should be remembered that this was not an official program of the established church. On the contrary, it was disliked, but conveniently ignored, by the crown until excesses developed within it which forced the government to attempt to suppress it completely. Instead, this program developed from the concern of a few of the bishops--men who had firsthand knowledge of the continental prophezei--who were concerned with clerical ignorance and who were determined to remedy the evil.

The earliest record of a prophesying was in a letter [dated October 16, 1564] written by Edwin Gaston to a man named Haddon.[1] Therein Gaston made the comment:

> Since your departure from Norwich the preachers from the city have taken in hand, both for their better exercise and also for the education of the people, prophesying: which is done once in three weeks, when one first interprets a piece of the

---

[1] State Papers, Domestic, Elizabeth, Addenda, XII, p. 27 (Calender, 1601-1603, p. 552).

> Scriptures, which at present is Paul to the Romans, for an hour, and then two others reply for half an hour, when we end with prayer.[1]

This evidence is significant for two reasons. First, it should be noted that this first prophesying took place in the diocese of Norwich which was under the spiritual control of John Parkhurst. Indeed, it is not inconceivable that Parkhurst was its instigator. When we remember that Parkhurst spent his entire exile (1554-1558) in Zurich where he daily attended the sessions of the prophezei and gained an appreciation of its function, it is not strange that the English counterpart should have had its inception in the Norwich diocese. Further, it should be noted that while the data is brief and scanty, this prophesying in 1564 appears to have had the same purpose and structure as that of the Zurich program: ministers engaged in biblical exegesis for the edification of clergy and laity. Thus the possibility of Tigurine influence in England at this point is most likely.

As the months passed, diocese after diocese established its own version of the prophesying.[3] As a teaching technique it was invaluable. But in time and in places it ceased to be a medium of biblical exegesis and became an important medium of Puritan propaganda. Ministers frequently took occasion to vent their feelings on church discipline and to call into question the episcopal structure of the church's government.[1] By 1574 the crown, fearful that here lay the seed-bed of revolution, moved to silence the practice forever. Opposition to the order was great. Parish priests, bishops and influential persons within the queen's own Privy Council opposed it. Consequently a stalemate was reached. Supporters of the prophesyings sought to correct the abuses and to return them to their original purpose. Bishops openly issued strict regulations governing the procedures of the prophesyings. For example, Bishop Sandys of London in his regulations for the prophesyings in Hertfordshire commanded them to keep to the text of scripture and to avoid "controversies of our present time or state: neither glancing closely or openly at any persons, public or private; much less confuting one another."[2] He further stated their design and purpose:

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Cf. Charles D. Cremeans, The Reception of Calvinistic Thought in England (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949), pp. 96-98. Cremeans traces the prophesyings to Genevan sources. No reference is made to the Tigurine prophezei.

[3] John Strype, Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion (4 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1824), II, Paet I, pp. 472-476.

> All their [preachers'] care ought to be to rip up the text; to show the sense of the Holy Ghost; and briefly, pithily, and plainly to observe such things as hereafter may well be applied in

---

[1] John Strype, The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker 3 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1821), II, p. 358.

[2] John Strype, Annals of the Reformation (7 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1824), II, Part I, p. 473.

preaching, concerning either doctrine or manners.[1]

The continual struggle between the crown and the church concerning the Prophesyings need not detain us. It is sufficient to point out their importance and to indicate that in purpose and structure they bore a close resemblance to that of the Tigurine prophezei.

Bullinger's Literary Influence in England 1559-1586

As in the reign of Edward VI, Bullinger's literary efforts were an important source of his influence in Elizabethan England. No less than fourteen titles of his were published in England in Latin and/or English in the period 1559-1587, and several of these went through one or more reprintings. Reference has already been made to Bullinger's writings relevant to the vestiarian controversy and to the Bull of excommunication of Elizabeth. Another group of his writings, however, have yet to be mentioned--those designed primarily to elucidate the Christian faith. Most of these appeared in the form of theological treatises or of collected sermons.

Whereas in the reign of Edward VI, his books translated and published in England were designed to speak to a particular situation, in Elizabethan England, generally no such pattern is discernible. Indeed it was not necessary.

---

[1] Ibid.

Bullinger's name was sufficiently well-known and appreciated that any treatise of his was in demand, and a profitable venture of the booksellers. To be sure, his popularity at this point was not unique. The works of any Reformed churchman were eagerly sought and read. The battle against Romanism was still being fought. Whatever came from the pen of Calvin, Bullinger, Beza, or Gualter was welcomed as ammunition for the struggle at hand.

Bullinger's theological treatises were especially prized for the clarity and succinctness with which they presented the Christian faith. The following are those which appeared in Elizabeth's reign:

1572 Common places of Christian Religion. Here Bullinger was seeking to do on a much smaller scale what his Decades were designed to accomplish in greater detail--to survey the major doctrines of the Christian faith.

1572 Questions of Religion cast abroad in Helvetia by the Adversaries of the same. Originally Bullinger had published this in Switzerland as a positive statement of Reformed theology in opposition to Catholic dogma. John Cox, the English translator, intended that it should serve the same purpose in England.

1575 The Tragedies of Tyrants exercised upon the Church. This is basically a history of the persecution of the church from the time of Caesar Augustus until the end of the middle ages. He shows that the church was not only persecuted by civil magistrates, but also by popes and other members of the Roman hierarchy. His concluding chapter deals with the problem of God's sovereignty over his church.

1579 A most godly and learned Discourse of the worthiness, authority, and sufficiency of the holy Scripture. The treatise was written early in Bullinger's career and was circulated in England in Latin for many years before it was translated. He was concerned therein to present a Protestant view of Scripture in opposition to that held by Romanists.

1582 The Sum of the four Evangelists. By a careful exegesis Bullinger seeks in this treatise to set forth the biblical view of Christ--"that Jesus is Christ, the only, perfect, and sufficient Savior of the faithful."

The printed sermon was an important medium of spreading the gospel in the sixteenth century. Indeed, it has been estimated that sermons comprised approximately 40 per cent of all the religious literature printed in that era. Certainly Bullinger's sermons were in great demand in Elizabeth's reign.

1561 A Hundred Sermons upon the Apocalypse. Bishop Parkhurst, Bullinger's close friend, considered them sufficiently important that he required all the clergy in Suffolk and Norfolk to read them either in English or in

Latin.[1] Another edition appeared in 1573.

1577 A most excellent Sermon on the Lord's Supper on Matthew XXVI. 20. Again the Tigurine doctrine of the Supper was set forth for English consumption.

1580 Of the End of the World and Judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ to come . . . . This title covered two sermons preached by Bullinger to the ministers of Zurich. They are basically an attack upon the whole Catholic structure.

1577, 1584, 1586, 1587 The Decades. We have seen that Bullinger's Decades initially became known to Englishmen in Edward's time. It was not until the reign of Elizabeth, however, that they made their greatest contribution to the life of the English church. It is impossible to estimate the degree to which they were known and read in the early years of this reign. It would not be unwarranted to assume that they were read by the scholars in Latin and by others in the various truncated English versions which appeared from time to time. It was not, however, until 1577 that the Decades were first completely translated into English and published as one book with a view to solving the serious problem of clerical ignorance. In that year Bishop Cooper's "Injunctions for Lincoln Diocese" made the following provisions:

---

[1] ZL, I, p. 99. A latin edition appeared in the same year bearing the title, In apocalypsium conciones centum.

> 16. [item], that the ministers bend themselves diligently to the study of the Holy Scriptures and word of God; and that every parson and vicar under the degree of a Master of Arts, or a preacher allowed by the hand and seal of the Bishop, and also every curate serving in a benefice where a preacher is not resident shall, before the first of September next coming, buy the Decades of Bullinger either in Latin or English (being now for that purpose translated), and every week to read over one sermon in such sort as he be able to make some reasonable account of it, and likewise every day in the week with like diligence to read over one chapter at the least of the Bible, taking some notes in a paper book of such wholesome sentences and good matter as he shall observe in the reading as well of the Bible as of the Decades before mentioned, that he may show the same when he shall be thereunto called.
>
> 17. [item], and that this order may be better observed, I earnestly require the archdeacons and officials that, in the end of their next visitation of Michaelmas, they take unto them one or two of the best learned and most discreet preachers of that part where they sit and call for such ministers as is above mentioned, and to will them there as well to show their Bibles as also the Book of Decades with every man's name written in the end of their said books; and from time to time the said archdeacons or officials, associated as before in the end of every visitation, shall cause the said parsons, vicars, or curates to show some account of their task in reading the aforesaid books, and within one fortnight after to certify unto me their ordinary the names of such as they find negligent in the premisses; and if the shortness of time will not suffer the said officers to make sufficient trial of their diligence, then they shall appoint the ministers to resort partly to themselves, partly to such grave and learned preachers as shall dwell next that place where such ministers are, that they may be by them in reasonable time certified of the truth.[1]

That the injunctions were actually implemented at this point is borne out in the numerous references to be found in the

---

[1] W. P. M. Kennedy, Elizabethan Episcopal Administration (3 vols.; London: Alcuin Club Collections, 1924), II, pp. 45-46.

Northill Churchwarden's accounts: five shillings for "a boke called Bullinger's Decades to the use of our curat."[1]

The translator's preface gives an important insight into the nature of the sermons as they were understood by Elizabethan Englishmen. Primarily, of course, they were regarded as foundation materials for the education of the clergy in a reformed church. But in addition thereto they were regarded as real sermons designed to be preached from the pulpit. The translator expressed it this way:

> For in very deed, this book is a book of Sermons: Sermons in name and in nature: fit to be read out of the pulpit unto the simplest and rudest people of the land: the doctrine of them very plain, without ostentation, curiosity, perplexity, vanity, or superfluity: very sound also, without Popery, Anabaptism, Servetianism, or any other heresy . . . .[2]

In comparison to other literature of this sort he makes these interesting remarks:

> No writer yet in the hands of men [is better equipped to educate the clergy] than Master Bullinger in these his Decades, who in them amendeth much Calvin's obscurity, with singular perspicuity: and Musculus scholastical subtilty, with great planness and even popular facility. And all those points of Christian doctrine, which are not to be found in one, but handled in all: Bullinger packeth up all, and that in good order, in this one book of small quantity.[3]

Possibly this explains the attended popularity which seems to have surrounded the Decades in subsequent years. In 1583 we find Bishop Middleton stating in his "Injunctions for St. David's Diocese": "32. Item, that the Paraphrases may be provided in every parish church, or rather Bullinger's Decades in English, for it is much more profitable." It would appear that as a result of this provision, and possibly others of which we are not familiar, there was a greater demand than the booksellers could supply. As a result, in 1584 a second edition came forth in three volumes from the press of R. Newberie.

---

[1] Powel M. Dawley, John Whitgift and the English Reformation (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954), p. 201.

[2] Heinrich Bullinger, "Fiftie godly and learned Sermons . . ." (1577), Preface.

[3] Ibid.

All of this was prefatory to the important event of late 1586. On December 2, there was submitted to the upper house of the Convocation of Canterbury by Archbishop Whitgift certain "orders for the better increase of learning in the inferior clergy, and for more diligent preaching and catechising" which made the following provisions regarding the Decades:

> Every minister having cure, and being under the degrees of master of arts and bachelor of law, and not licensed to be a public preacher, shall before the second day of February next provide a Bible, and Bullinger's Decades in Latin or English, and a paper book, and shall every day read over one chapter of the holy scriptures, and note the principal contents thereof briefly in his paper book, and shall every week read over one sermon in the said Decades, and note likewise the chief matters therein contained in the said paper; and shall once in every quarter . . . show his said note to some preacher near adjoining to be assigned for that purpose.[1]

---

[1] Gorham, op. cit., p. 497.

In March, 1587, the "Orders" were read in the lower house of Convocation after which it was reported that "the archbishop exhorted the clergy to do their duty,"[1] i.e., enforce the provisions of the "Orders." During the late spring and early summer the "Orders" were transmitted to the dioceses. Archbishop Whitgift's Register contains a letter written on November 1, 1588, to all the bishops wherein he inquired, "generally howe in all points the said Articles and Canons have bynne put in execution."[2]

To meet the demand created by these "Orders," there was published in 1586 a Latin edition of the Decades, Sermonum decades quinque de potissimus christianae religionis capitibus, and another English edition in 1587.

In the mid-nineteenth century a debate raged within Anglicanism as to the significance of these events surrounding the Decades. Those of High Church sympathies insisted that since there is no evidence that the "Orders" received royal approval, they cannot be said to have been implemented and thus the Decades never expressed the official theological position of the Church of England. The opposing party, led by such stalwarts as George Gorham and William Goode, proud of the continental heritage in the English Reformation, strongly contended that while there is no absolute proof that the "Orders" ever received official sanction, subsequent events previously enumerated tend to justify that conclusion. If the position of the latter group is right, and this writer believes it is, then Bullinger's Decades stood in a unique place in Elizabethan church life. They were regarded by the ranking ecclesiastics of the Church of England as containing a sound interpretation of the Christian Gospel and therefore normative for the theological position of the established church. One can only speculate at the profound influence these books may have had under these circumstances.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 496.

[2] Ibid., p. 501.

In conclusion it should be pointed out that numerous copies of Bullinger's books were sent to England as gifts of the author to his many friends. As in the time of Edward, Bullinger found this an important source of his influence. One need only read the Zurich Letters to appreciate the extent of this practice.

CONCLUSION

I

The Sources of the Reformed Tradition

Though it has not been the primary aim of this dissertation to call attention to the roots of the Reformed Tradition, it has, nevertheless, served that end. And in so doing it calls Reformation historiography to task for its frequent distortion and inclination to oversimplify the sources of this vital movement in the sixteenth century.

Symptomatic of this problem has been the tendency in modern historical scholarship to use interchangeably the terms "Reformed" and "Calvinistic," meaning thereby that that which was "Reformed" was of necessity "Calvinistic," and vice versa. Indeed we would be led to believe that the Reformed faith was centered in Geneva, and that apart from that city, there was no significant center of Reformed Protestantism in Europe. To be sure, that which was Calvinistic, was Reformed, but, as this dissertation has revealed, the converse was not always true. There was a strong viril Tigurine movement at work in the sixteenth century which was also Reformed, but not Calvinistic.

Too often historians have unjustly minimized the importance of the Zwinglian Reformation. Indeed it has frequently been treated as if it were an insignificant labor which was extinguished with the Reformer's death and in Christian history left no important legacy. But the facts do not bear this out. It should be remembered that when Zwingli went to work in Zurich (1519), Calvin was still a lad of ten years. Within a decade the Tigurine Reformer had completed his work, and was sacrificing his life on the battlefield of Kappel (1531) while Calvin still remained a communicant within the Roman Church. The new antistes of the Zurich church, Heinrich Bullinger, was well established as a leader and a theologian before Calvin ever spent that fateful night in Geneva in the summer of 1536. In the eyes of evangelical Englishmen, indeed in the eyes of all men throughout Europe concerned with church reform, the Tigurine church under Bullinger's leadership was an important center of Reformed Protestantism, before Calvin began his monumental work in Geneva. In fact the Tigurine church served as a model to other churches throughout Europe giving birth to reform. Thus from its inception until the end of the sixteenth century, it was held in high respect. Compared to Geneva, it was easily its equal in reputation, influence and prestige, and in the eyes of many it was superior. Despite this, much of Reformation historiography has ignored the significant contribution of this Swiss city to the Reformed Tradition.

This is not to minimize the importance of Calvin and the Genevan Reformation. Indeed Calvinism had such a dominating influence upon Christian history after Calvin's death that we have been guilty of projecting that dominance back upon the sixteenth century when the Genevan Reformer was alive and at work. This is not to deny that Calvin was a powerfully influential man in his own day, but it is to insist that Calvin and the Genevan church should be seen in a proper perspective with relation to other centers of reformation activity, especially Zurich.

Consistent with this traditional misunderstanding of the sources of Reformed Protestantism, scholars have spoken of the influence of "Calvinism" upon English church life in the sixteenth century (e.g., C. D. Cremeans, The Reception of Calvinistic Thought in England). The term "Calvinism" so used is intended to cover all Reformed influence and to imply that it was derived ultimately from Geneva. To be sure Calvinism was an important source of Reformed influence in England as scholars have repeatedly shown, but it was not the sole source. In this dissertation we have seen that Tigurine influence was pronounced from the latter years of Henry VIII until the close of the reign of Elizabeth. By means of books, correspondence, and personal contact Tigurine churchmen sought to make the Reformed faith relevant to the English scene. We have seen how their labors were augmented by the work of such Reformed churchmen as Martyr, Bucer, à Lasco, Ochino and others of lesser prominence. To be sure Martyr, à Lasco, and Ochino appear to have been more closely related to the Tigurine understanding of the Gospel. Thus we conclude that Tigurine channels of an infinite variety were consistently open to England, pouring forth the Gospel in a concerted effort to win England to the Reformed faith.

But lest the writer be guilty of unduly stressing the polarity between Zurich and Geneva, attention should once again be called to the strong bonds of unity which existed between the two cities. Indeed, their ties, especially in theology, were so close that it often becomes impossible for one to differentiate the individual threads of their influence in England. For this reason the writer has attempted to exercise extreme caution in labeling certain facets of English church life as being the direct result of Tigurine influence. In certain instances the evidence is sufficiently strong that we may conclude that Tigurine influence was probably responsible for a particular practice or belief. A more balanced perspective of Calvinistic influence could be achieved if scholars would exercise equal restraint in assessing Genevan influence in England. We could then avoid the precarious position of attributing to Calvin that which could just as easily have come from Zurich. Thus in order to achieve the balanced accuracy which historical scholarship demands, we must appreciate the fact that in the sixteenth century the Reformed tradition penetrated English Christianity from two powerful centers of Reformed activity--Geneva _and_ Zurich.

II

The Contributions of Bullinger and the Tigurine Tradition to the Spread of the Reformed Faith in England

The Reformed faith made a great impact upon England in the sixteenth century. Certainly no other continental tradition made such a penetrating and lasting mark upon English Christianity. Within Anglicanism itself there were clear traces of the Reformed faith in its theology, worship, and piety, while within the circles of Non-conformity there was almost a slavish desire to imitate Christian forms coming out of Switzerland. From the days of Edward VI through the reign of Elizabeth the Reformed tide rolled in. The Genevan contributions to this English flood have been told many times. It now behooves us to assess the contribution of Bullinger and the Tigurine church.

In the first place it should be noted that the Tigurine church, like that of Geneva, contributed to the spread of the Reformed faith in numerable ways which can no longer be measured by the historian. The majority of Reformed doctrines were the common property of both Zurich and Geneva. It would, therefore, be impossible to measure the contributions of either of these centers to the spread of such a body of thought in England. In the past Geneva has been recognized as a fundamental source of many of these doctrines. In the future, however, it must be recognized that Zurich, too, played a significant role in the spread of this common body of Reformed thought in England.

More specifically, however, Bullinger and the Tigurine church made some unique contributions to the spread of the Reformed faith. To Bullinger and his associates must go the credit for introducing the Reformed faith into England. To be sure the name and work of Zwingli were known in England before Bullinger ever assumed leadership of the Zurich church, but not in an effective way. The few Zwinglian treatises published in England actually attained their greatest popularity when the influence of Bullinger was on the rise. Nor can Calvin receive the credit. Cremeans has correctly stated that Calvin's influence in England before 1553 cannot have been great. To be sure he was known to churchmen through the circulation of his books and to men of influence through his letters of admonition to them, but there is no indication that his voice was heard with any degree of authority in those early years. On the other hand we have seen how determined Bullinger and his associates were as early as 1540 that England should be won to the Reformed faith. Through every conceivable medium the Tigurine gospel poured into England where it became firmly implanted as a formative power in the changing religious scene. It is, therefore, wholly justifiable for us to attribute the introduction of the Reformed religion into England to Tigurine efforts.

Bullinger and his associates must also be given much credit for the rise of the Puritan movement in England. It will be readily admitted that Puritanism as a movement had its inception in the reign of Elizabeth. But this must not obscure the fact that Englishmen sympathetic to Puritan ideals were clearly making their witness as early as the reign of Edward. Certainly John Hooper is the clearest illustration. With a strong forceful voice he expressed all of the ideals and principles of the Christian life and community which became so dear to Elizabethan Puritanism. It is, therefore, not without foundation that he has been called "the Father of English Puritanism." This being the case, some credit for the rise of Puritanism must go to Bullinger and Zurich for it has been one of the concerns of this dissertation to show that such was the source of Hooper's theology. Certainly the term "disciple" is appropriate as an expression of Hooper's relationship to Zurich. Indeed he was very proud of his dependence upon the Tigurine divines and repeatedly referred to them as the source of all he knew. Thus insofar as Hooper was instrumental in the rise of Puritanism, at least to that degree must the Tigurine church also be given due credit for the rise of that movement.

Finally it can be said that Bullinger and the Tigurine church played a unique role in the education of ministers for English pulpits by providing not only the textbooks for their education in the form of Bullinger's Decades, but also the method of instruction as found in the Prophesyings. Reformed theology permeated the Anglican church through the Decades making the latter one of the most important textbooks for Reformed ideas in England. There is little doubt that in the sixteenth century it rivaled Calvin's Institutes as the Bible of the Reformed faith, even if it has lost its importance for later Reformed Christianity. The Prophesyings, also, provided a vital educational form which proved immensely popular in Elizabethan England. Through this medium unlearned clerics were indoctrinated with the principles of the Reformed faith. It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of this institution for the rise of Puritanism and for the obviously strong leanings of Anglicanism itself toward the Reformed faith.

In these and probably in many other ways now lost to historical ascertainment, Bullinger and the Tigurine tradition made a vital and profound contribution to the spread of the Reformed faith in England in the sixteenth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Printed Primary Sources

Bale, John. *The Pageant of Popes*. London: Thomas Marshe, 1574.

Bonnet, Jules (ed.). *Letters of John Calvin*. 3 vols. Translated by David Constable. Edinburgh: Thomas Constable and Co., 1855.

Bradford, John. *The Writings of John Bradford*. Edited by Aubrey Townsend for The Parker Society. Cambridge: The University Press, 1853.

Bromiley, G. W. (ed.). *Zwingli and Bullinger*. Vol. XIV: *The Library of Christian Classics*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953.

Bullinger, Heinrich. *A most godly and learned Discourse of the worthiness, authority, and sufficiency of the holy Scripture . . .* . London: Thomas Dawson, 1579.

______. *The Judgment of the Reverend Father Master Henry Bullinger . . . in certain matters of religion . . . .* [Emden ?], 1566.

______. *The Tragedies of Tyrants . . . .* London: William How, 1575.

______. *A most excellent Sermon of the Lord's Supper . . . . London: Thomas Dawson and Thomas Gardyner, [1577 ?].*

______. *The Christian State of Matrimony*. London: John Day, 1550.

______. *Two epistles, one of Henry Bullinger . . . another of John Calvin . . . .* London: Robert Stoughton, 1548.

______. *A Hundred Sermons upon the Apocalypse . . . .* London: John Day, 1561.

______. *An Exhortation to the Ministers of God's Word . . . .* London: John Allde, 1575.

______. *Diarium*. Edited by Emil Egli. Vol. XV: *Quellen zur Schweizerischen Reformationsgeschichte*. Basel: Buch- und Antiquariatshandlung, 1904.

Bullinger, Heinrich. *The Decades*. 4 vols. Edited by Thomas Harding for The Parker Society. Cambridge: The University Press, 1849-1851.

Foxe, John. *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*. 8 vols. 3rd edition. Edited by Josiah Pratt. London: George Seeley, 1870.

Great Britain. Public Record Office. *Calender of the Patent Rolls - Edward VI*. Vols. I (1547-1548), II (1548-1549).

———. *Calender of State Papers, Domestic, Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth*. Edited by Robert Lemon, *et. al*. London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, and Roberts, 1856, etc.

Cardwell, Edward. *Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England . . . .* 2 vols. Oxford: The University Press, 1839.

———. *Synodalia*. 2 vols. Oxford: The University Press, 1842.

Great Britain, Public Record Office. *Acts of the Privy Council of England*. Vols. II, III (New Series). Edited by John Roche. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1890-1891.

Egli, Emil and Schoch, Rudolf (eds.). *Johannes Kesslers Sabbata mit kleineren Schriften und Briefen*. St. Gallen: Fehr'sche Buchhandlung, 1902.

Gee, Henry and Hardy, William J. *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1921.

Gorham, George Cornelius. *Gleanings of a Few Scattered Ears, during the Period of the Reformation in England and of the times immediately succeeding; AD 1533 to AD 1588*. London: Bell and Daldy, 1857.

Hooper, John. *The Early Writings of John Hooper*. Edited by Samuel Carr for The Parker Society. Cambridge: The University Press, 1843.

———. *Later Writings of Bishop Hooper together with his Letters and other Pieces*. Edited by Charles Nevinson for The Parker Society. Cambridge: The University Press, 1852.

Kennedy, W. P. M. (ed.). *Elizabethan Episcopal Administration*. Vols. XXV-XXVII: Alcuin Club Collections. London: A. R. Mowbray and Co. Ltd., 1924.

Kuyper, A. (ed.). *Johannes à Lasco Opera*. Vol. II. Amsterdam: Muller, 1866.

Martyr, Peter. *An unpublished Letter of Peter Martyr, . . . to Henry Bullinger . . . Just after the Completion of the Second Book of Common Prayer*. Edited by William Goode. London: J. Hatchard and Son, 1850.

Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation. 2 vols. Edited by Hastings Robinson for The Parker Society. Cambridge: The University Press, 1846-1847.

Parker, Matthew. *Correspondence*. Edited by John Bruce and Thomas Perowns for The Parker Society. Cambridge: The University Press, 1853.

Peel, Albert (ed.). *The Seconde Parte of a Register*. 2 vols. Cambridge: The University Press, 1915.

Pellican, Conrad. *Die Hauschronik Konrad Pellikans von Rufach*. Strassburg: Heitz und Muendel, 1892.

Schaff, Philip. *The Creeds of Christendom*. 3 vols. 6th edition, revised. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, [1919].

Schroeder, H. J. *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*. London: B. Herder Book Co., 1955.

The Two Liturgies, a.d. 1549, and a.d. 1552: with other documents set forth by authority in the reign of King Edward VI. Edited by Joseph Ketley for The Parker Society. Cambridge: The University Press, 1844.

Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation. Vols. XIV-XVI: Alcuin Club Papers. Edited by Walter H. Frere and William M. Kennedy. London: Longman's, Green and Co., 1910.

Whitgift, John. *The Works of John Whitgift*. 3 vols. Edited by John Ayre for The Parker Society. Cambridge: The University Press, 1851-1853.

[Whittingham, William]. *A Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfort 1554-1558 AD*. Edited by Edward Arber. London: Privately Printed, 1907.

Wyss, Bernard. *Die Chronik des Bernard Wyss 1519-1530*. Edited by Georg Finsler. Basel: Basler Buch- und Antiquariats - Handlung, 1901.

The Zurich Letters comprising the Correspondence of several English Bishops and others with some of the Helevetian Reformers during the early part of the reign of Queen Elizabeth 2 vols. Edited by Hastings Robinson for The Parker Society. Cambridge: The University Press, 1842-1845.

Printed Secondary Sources

Addison, James Thayer. "Early Anglican Thought, 1559-1567," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, XXII (September, 1953), 247-369.

Allen, J. W. *A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century*. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1928.

Baird, Henry M. *Theodore Beza*. New York: The Knickerbocker Press, 1899.

Bay, J. Christian. "Conrad Gesner, (1516-1565) The Father of Bibliography, An Appreciation," *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, X (April, 1916), 53-86.

Beeman, G. B. "The Early History of the Strangers' Church, 1550 to 1561," *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of London*, XV (1933-1937), 261-282.

Bellardi, Werner. *Die Geschichte der "Christlichen Gemeinschaft" in Strassburg (1546-1550)*. Leipzig: M. Heinsius, 1934.

Benrath, Karl. *Bernard Ochino of Siena*. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1877.

Bicknell, E. J. *A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1946.

Birnbaum, Norman. "The Zwinglian Reformation in Zurich," *Past and Present*, XV (April, 1959), 27-47.

Blanke, Fritz. "Zwinglis 'Prophezei' und die Anfänge des Puritanismus," *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, No. 1175, June 29, 1939.

________. *Der Junge Bullinger 1504-1531*. Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1942.

Bloesch, E. *Geschichte der Schweizerische Reformierten Kirchen*. 2 vols. Bern: Verlag von Schmid und Francke, 1898-1899.

_______. "Konigin Elizabeth I. und Zürich," *Schweizer Journal*, I (May, 1953), 40-46, 54.

_______. "Die englischen Flüchtlinge in Zürich unter Konigin Elizabeth I," *Zwingliana*, IX (1949-1953), 531-535.

_______. "Von privaten Zürcher Beziehungen zu England im 16. Jahrhundert," *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, July 19, 1947, Nrs. 1402 und 1405.

_______. "Rudolph Gwalters Reise nach England im Jahr 1537," *Zwingliana*, VIII (1944-1948), 433-471.

_______. "Der Zürcher Apelles," *Zwingliana*, IX (1949-1953), 16-50.

Bromiley, G. W. *Baptism and the Anglican Reformers*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1953.

Brown, Peter Hume. *John Knox, A Biography*. 2 vols. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1895.

Buchberger, Michael (ed.). *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*. 8 vols. Freiburg: Herder and Co., 1936.

Burnet, Gilbert. *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*. 3 vols. Dublin: A. Thames, 1730-1733.

Cardwell, Edward. *A History of Conferences and other Proceedings connected with the revision of The Book of Common Prayer; from the year 1558 to the year 1690*. Oxford: The University Press, 1840.

Carruthers, William. "Edward VI. Granting a Charter to the Presbyterians," *The Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society of England*, I (May, 1914), 14-20.

Clay, H. Alexander. "Reformation Contacts with Zurich (1530-1575)," *The Modern Churchman*, XXIII (June, 1933), 120-127.

Cowell, Henry J. "The Sixteenth-Century English-speaking Refugee Churches at Strassburg, Basle, Zurich, Aarau, Wesel and Emden," *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of London*, XV (1937), 612-655.

Cowell, Henry J. "English Protestant Refugees in Strassburg, 1553-1558," *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of London*, XV (1933), 69-120.

______. "The French-Walloon Church at Glastonbury, 1550-1553," *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of London*, XIII (1923-1929), 483-515.

Cremeans, C. D. *The Reception of Calvinistic Thought in England*. ("Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences," Vol. XXXI, No. 1.) Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1949.

Davies, Horton. *The Worship of the English Puritans*. Glasgow: The University Press, 1948.

Davies, Rupert E. *The Problem of Authority in the Continental Reformers*. London: The Epworth Press, 1946.

Dawley, Powel M. *John Whitgift and the English Reformation*. New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1954.

Denzinger, Heinrich J. D. *The Sources of Catholic Dogma*. London: B. Herder Book Co., [1957].

Dimock, Nathaniel. *Vox Liturgiae Anglicanae: The History of the Book of Common Prayer in its bearing on present eucharistic controversies*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1910.

Dix, Gregory. "Dixit Cranmer et Non Timuit - I," *The Church Quarterly Review*, CXLV (Oct.-Dec., 1947), 145-176.

______. "Dixit Cranmer et Non Timuit - II," *The Church Quarterly Review*, CXLVI (Apr.-June, 1948), 44-60.

Dixon, Richard W. *History of the Church of England from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction*. 6 vols. London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1878.

Dollfus-Zodel, Elsa. *Bullingers Einfluss auf das Zürcherische Staatswesen von 1531-1575*. Zürich: Reutiman und Cie., 1931.

Dugmore, C. W. *The Mass and the English Reformers*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1958.

Egli, Emil. *Schweizerische Reformationsgeschichte*. Zürich: Zürcher und Ferrer, 1910.

Egli, Emil. *Analecta Reformatoria*. 3 vols. Zurich: Zurcher und Furrer, 1901.

______. "Bullingers Beziehungen zu Zwingli," *Zwingliana*, I (1897-1904), 439-443.

______. Ist Bullinger von Zwingli als Nachfolger vorgeschlagen worden?" *Zwingliana*, I (1897-1904), 443-444.

Emerson, Everett H. "Calvin and Covenant Theology," *Church History*, XXV (June, 1956), 136-144.

Ernst, Ulrich. *Geschichte des Zurcherischen Schulwesens bis gegen das Ende des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts*. Winterthur: Bleuler-Hausheer und Cie., 1879.

Farner, Oskar. "Die Bullinger-Briefe," *Zwingliana*, X (September, 1954), 103-108.

______. "Heinrich Bullinger als Hausvater," *Zwingliana*, X (September, 1954), 97-103.

Fast, Heinold. *Heinrich Bullinger und die Täufer*. Weierhof: Mennonitischen Geschichtsverein, 1959.

Frere, Walter Howard. *The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I. Vol. V: A History of the English Church*. Edited by W. Stephens and W. Hunt. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1904.

Garrett, Christina H. *The Marian Exiles*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1938.

Gee, Henry. *The Elizabethan Clergy and the Settlement of Religion 1558-1564*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1898.

Good, James I. "The Antistes of Zurich," *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, VI (October, 1895), 593-613.

Goode, William. *The Doctrine of the Church of England as to the Effects of Baptism in the Case of Infants*. London: J. Hatchard and Son, 1849.

Graf von Korff, Emanuel. *Die Anfange der Foederaltheologie und ihre erste Ausgestaltung in Zurich und Holland*. Bonn: Emil Eisele, 1908.

Hardwick, Charles. *A History of the Articles of Religion*. Cambridge: John Deighton, 1851.

Harris, Jesse W. *John Bale, A Study in the Minor Literature of the Reformation.* ("Illinois Studies in Language and Literature," Vol. XXV, No. 4.) Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1940.

Henson, H. Hensley. *The Relation of the Church of England to the Other Reformed Churches.* Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1911.

Hildebrandt, Walter and Zimmerman, Rudolf. *Bedeutung und Geschichte des zweiten Helvetischen Bekenntnisses.* Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1938.

Hinds, Allen B. *The Making of the England of Elizabeth.* New York: Macmillan and Co., 1895.

Hoffmann-de Visme, Rene. "The Influence of the English Protestant Refugees in Geneva on England in the XVIth Century," *The Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society of England*, VI (May, 1936), 3-20.

Hollweg, Walter. *Heinrich Bullingers Hausbuch.* ("Beiträge zur Geschichte und Lehre der Reformierten Kirche," VIII.) Giessen: Münchowsche Universitätsdruckerei, 1956.

Hopf, Constantin. "Bishop Hooper's 'Notes' to the King's Council," *Journal of Theological Studies*, XLIV (July - October, 1943), 194-199.

________. *Martin Bucer and the English Reformation.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946.

Hottinger, Johann Jacob. *Einfluss d. fremden Glaubenflüchtlings in Bullingers Zeit.* Zurich: 1845.

Hulbert, Eri Baker. *The English Reformation and Puritanism.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1908.

Hunt, John. *Religious Thought in England from the Reformation to the End of the last Century.* 3 vols. London: Strahan and Co., Publishers, 1870.

Jacobs, Henry Eyster. *The Lutheran Movement in England.* Philadelphia: G. W. Frederick, 1894.

Jocher, Christian Gottlieb. *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexicon.* 4 vols. Leipzig: Johann Friederich Gleditschens Buchhandlung, 1750.

Jong, Peter Y. de. *The Covenant Idea in New England Theology 1620-1847.* Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1945.

Jung, Rudolf. *Die englische Flüchtlings-Gemeinde in Frankfurt am Main 1554-1559*. Frankfort: Joseph Baer and Co., 1910.

Knappen, M. M. *Tudor Puritanism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1939.

Kolfhaus, W. *Der Verkehr Calvins mit Bullinger*. ("Calvinstudien") [1909).

Kraft, Carl. *Aufzeichnungen des schweizerischen Reformators Heinrich Bullinger über sein Studium zu Emmerich und Köln (1516-1522) und dessen Briefwechsel mit Freunden in Köln, Erzbishof Hermann von Wied u.* Elberfeld: Sam. Lucas, 1870.

Kressner, Helmut. *Schweizer Ursprünge des anglikanischen Staatskirchentums*. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1953.

Lang, August. *Puritanismus und Pietismus*. Ansback: C. Brugel und Sohn, 1941.

Largiader, Anton. *Geschichte von Stadt und Landschaft Zürich*. Zurich: Eugen Reutsch Verlag, 1945.

LeBas, Charles Webb. *The Life of Bishop Jewel*. London: Gilbert and Rivington, 1835.

Ley, Roger. *Kirchenzucht bei Zwingli*. ("Quellen und Abhandlungen zur Geschichte des schweizerischen Protestantismus," II.) Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1948.

Lorimer, Peter. *John Knox and the Church of England*. London: Henry S. King and Co., 1875.

MacGregor, Geddes. *Corpus Christi*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1958.

McLelland, Joseph C. "The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination according to Peter Martyr," *Scottish Journal of Theology*, VIII (September, 1955), 255-271.

______. *The Visible Words of God*. London: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.

McNeill, John Thomas. *The History and Character of Calvinism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1954.

Maitland, S. R. *Essays on Subjects connected with the Reformation in England*. London: Francis and John Rivington, 1849.

Martin, Charles. *Les Protestants Anglais refugees a Geneve au temps de Calvin 1555-60*. Geneve: Albert Kundig, 1915.

Maxwell, William D. *John Knox's Genevan Service Book*. London: Oliver and Boyd, 1931.

Mezger, J. J. *Geschichte der Deutschen Bibelubersetzungen in der schweizerischreformirten Kirche von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart*. Basel: Bahnmaiers Verlag (C. Detloff), 1876.

Miller, Perry. *Errand into the Wilderness*. Cambridge (Mass.): The Belknap Press, 1956.

Mörikofer, J. C. *Geschichte der Evangelischen Flüchtlinge in der Schweiz*. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1876.

Muss-Arnolt, William. "Puritan Efforts and Struggles, 1550-1603; A Bio-Bibliographical Study," *The American Journal of Theology*, XXIII (1919), 345-366; 471-499.

Neale, J. E. *Elizabeth I and her Parliaments 1559-1581*. New York: British Book Center, Inc., [1952].

________. "The Elizabethan Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity," *English Historical Review*, LXV (July, 1950), 304-332.

Norwood, Frederick. "The Marian Exiles - Denizens or Sojourners?" *Church History*, XIII (June, 1944), 100-110.

Oechsli, Wilhelm. *History of Switzerland 1499-1914*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1922.

Orelli, Fel von. *Antistes Bullingers Gastfreundschaft gegenüber flüchtlinge Glaubensgenossen*. Zurich: Hülfgesellschaft, 1840.

Peck, George T. "John Hales and the Puritans during the Marian Exiles," *Church History*, X (June, 1941), 159-177.

Pestalozzi, Carl. *Heinrich Bullinger. Leben und ausgewählte Schriften*. ("Leben und ausgewählte Schriften der Väter und Begrunder der reformirten Kirche," V.) Elberfeld: R. L. Friderichs, 1858.

Pfister, Rudolf. "Zürich und das anglikanische Staatskirchentum," *Zwingliana*, X (Dezembre, 1955), 249-256.

Plummer, Alfred. *The Continental Reformation*. London: Roxburghe House, 1912.

Porter, Henry Culverwell. Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge. Cambridge: The University Press, 1958.

Price, F. Douglas. "Gloucester Diocese under Bishop Hooper 1551-3," Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society, LX (1938), 51-151.

Proctor, Francis and Frere, Walter H. A New History of The Book of Common Prayer with a rationale of its offices. London: Macmillan and Co., 1951.

Ranke, Leopold von. Die Reformation in der deutschen Schweiz. Basel: Rhein-Verlag, n.d.

Richardson, Cyril C. Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist. Evanston: Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1949.

Rupp, E. G. Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition. Cambridge: The University Press, 1949.

Schaff, Philip. History of the Christian Church. Vol. VIII. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1950.

Schiess, Traugott. "Ein Jahr aus Bullingers Breifwechsel," Zwingliana, VI (1934), 16-33.

Schirmer, Gustav. Die Schweiz im Spiegel Englischer und Amerikanischer Literatur bis 1848. Zurich: Orell Fussli Verlag, 1929.

Schrenk, Gottlob. Gottesreich und Bund in ältern Protestantismus. ("Beiträge zur Förderung Christlicher Theologie," V.). Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1923.

Schulthess-Rechberg, Gustav von. Heinrich Bullinger, der Nachfolger Zwinglis. ("Scriften d. Verlag für Reformationsgeschichte," LXXXII.) Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1904.

Scott-Pearson, A. F. Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism. Cambridge: The University Press, 1925.

Smith, Lacey Baldwin. Tudor Prelates and Politics 1536-1558. Princeton: The Princeton University Press, 1953.

Smithen, Frederick James. Continental Protestantism and the English Reformation. London: James Clark and Co., Limited, n.d.

Smyth, C. H. Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI. Cambridge: The University Press, 1926.

Southgate, W. M. "The Marian Exiles and the Influence of John Calvin," *History*, XXVII (September, 1942), 148-152.

Strasser, Otto E. "Der Consensus Tigurinus," *Zwingliana*, IX (1949-1953), 1-16.

Strype, John. *Ecclesiastical Memorials*. 3 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1822.

———. *Annals of the Reformation*. 7 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1824.

———. *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*. 3 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1821.

Sulzberger, H. G. *Geschichte der Reformation im Kanton Zürich*. Heiden: R. Weber, n.d.

Sykes, Norman. *Old Priest and New Presbyter*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1956.

Thompson, Bard. "Reformed Liturgies in Translation. I. Ulrich Zwingli," *Bulletin Theological Seminary of the Evangelical and Reformed Church*, XXVII (October, 1956), 1-21.

———. "Reformed Liturgies in Translation: Selections from a Lasco's Liturgy," *Theology and Life*, I (May, 1958), 106-112.

Timms, G. B. "Dixit Cranmer," *The Church Quarterly Review*, CXLIII (January-March, 1947), 217-234; CXLIV (April-June, 1947), 33-51.

Trinterud, Leonard J. "The Origins of Puritanism," *Church History*, XX (March, 1951), 37-57.

Vetter, Theodor. "Johannes Hooper, Bischof Von Gloucester und Worcester und seine Beziehungen zu Bullinger und Zurich," *Turicensia: Beiträge zur zürcherischen Geschichte*, Zurich: 1891.

———. *Englische Flüchtlinge un Zurich während der ersten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts*. Zurich: Art. Institut Orell Füssli, 1893.

———. *Relations between England and Zurich during the Reformation*. London: Elliot Stock, 1904.

———. *Litterarische Beziehungen zwischen England und der Schweiz im Reformationszeitalter*. Zurich: Zurcher und Furrer, 1901.

Walser, Peter. Die Prädestination bei Heinrich Bullinger. Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1957.

_______. "Bullingers Lehre von Menschen," Zwingliana, X (Juni, 1957), 409-428.

West, W. M. S. John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism. (For Private Circulation), 1955.

Woodhouse, Hugh F. The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology 1547-1603. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1954.

Zimmermann, G. R. Die Zürcher Kirche von der Reformation bis zum dritten Reformationsjubiläum 1519-1819. Zurich: S. Hohr, 1878.

Zuck, Lowell H. "The Influence of the Reformed Tradition on the Elizabethan Settlement, Concordia Theological Monthly, XXXI (April, 1960), 215-226.

Unpublished Doctoral Dissertations

Booty, John Everitt. "A Study of John Jewel as Apologist of the Church of England." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 1959.

Pratt, Melvyn Eugene, Jr. "Zwinglianism in England during the Reign of Elizabeth." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1953.

West, W. Morris S. "John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Zurich (Switzerland), 1953.